

The only viable foundation for an incorruptible historical truth-finding process is the cooperation between the authorities and donors. "

These demands were fully met by the historical work to which they were prefixed: It was "The Forced War" by David L. Hoggan, a work that caused a worldwide sensation, suddenly placed its author at the forefront of the living generation of historians and has seen numerous new editions to this day. Of course, this work has also met with opposition, including relatively little factual rebuttal, but all the more fierce polemics - unfortunately also from professional experts - which will not be dealt with here (this has already been done elsewhere).

D. L. Hoggan took little part in these disputes, but new major works appeared from him: the results of extended and in-depth study of sources and the maturation of new insights into the motives and contexts of historical events. This seems to me to be the kind of response to polemical contradiction that betrays the true historian. The first of these new major works was 1974 "Der unnötige Krieg", also published by the Institut für deutsche Nachkriegsgeschichte.

At this time, a third major work by D. L. Haggan, "The Blind Century", was already being planned and written, and it had long been clear to the satisfaction of the editor and publisher that the American historian would once again entrust its publication to the same hands. As the manuscript matured, it became clear that this, Haggan's most comprehensive work to date, would have to appear in two parts. I am now presenting the first part; the second is to follow a year later.

"The Blind Century" is the result of an enormous amount of historical work and considerable scholarly ambition: the probably successful attempt to interpret the world-historical developments of the past hundred years or so, whose often catastrophic course is still largely incomprehensible to most people, insofar as they strive for impartiality, from its revealed background.

No details of the content are to be anticipated here - this would not be in the reader's interest in view of the suspenseful presentation and the many dramatic highlights of the work. However, a few basic comments on this, the Institute's most comprehensive publication to date, are necessary.

There are various reasons why this work by an American historian, the first part of which deals mainly with the United States and therefore also bears the name America in its title, was first published in Germany. One of them, and not the least, is the fact that this is American history, which concerns, moves and excites the historically interested German - for these are events, inseparable from German history in the past hundred years, and they are historical figures and events that profoundly affected the fate of the Germans. Twice during this period, Americans and Germans-two peoples who for most of the time had only sympathy for each other-were forced into murderous confrontations. In this respect, the concatenation of American and German history has no parallel in world history, especially not in its one-sided negative effects: It was not uncommon for events in American domestic politics that were not really perceived as meaningless from Europe, but within a short time grew into gigantic dangers for Imperial or National Socialist Germany. The following pages describe and prove that German history in the twentieth century was made for long stretches in a distant country in places whose names most Germans had never heard, and in a way of which they had no idea until today.

Hoggan, the historian and philosopher of history, is fascinated by the fact that the Americans have already come to Europe twice in order to crush another great people with whom they had no real conflict of interest, the Germans, to the ground, inflicting gigantic damage on them and plunging them into misery. Never in the history of the world has one great nation done so much to another for so little reason, Hoggan claims, and asks about the causes of this incomprehensible event. The reasons that are offered in constant repetition and to which we have become accustomed, even accepted long ago, do not satisfy him: he exposes them as superficial and rejects them. His own investigation, underpinned by a wealth of documentation, leads to completely different conclusions - and the following pages are a harrowing, even agonizing, but necessary clarification.

A second comment should be made in advance on the reactions that the work will almost certainly trigger: accusations of anti-Americanism and anti-Semitism.

Certainly, Hoggan criticizes a great deal in the USA, the USA of yesterday and the USA of today, and this criticism is sometimes surprisingly open and sharp. Especially those many readers who harbor traditional German sympathies for America will suspect hostility towards the USA here. They should bear in mind that an American is speaking here and that this is first-hand criticism, even when cherished clichés are destroyed - for example, that of the great land of promise across the ocean that was given to Europe and the world at the beginning of the modern era and especially with the founding of the USA. The reality is recorded in sobering facts on the following pages: How the American dream was systematically squandered and ruined from the beginning in the interests of a rapacious, heedless minority.

The other accusation, that of anti-Semitism, can hardly be ignored in a work that openly addresses certain things and calls them by name and is published in the same year in which the television series "Holocaust" was received and discussed with great interest in Germany.

Hoggan considers the massive Jewish-Eastern European immigration to the USA from 1890 onwards to be disastrous, and

he proves that many of the bizarre and disastrous turns in US foreign policy were due to the excessive influence of Jewish advisors on weak US presidents. Moreover, he does not use euphemisms such as "culture-changing elements" or the like, but simply speaks of "Jews". And there are indeed quite a few unfriendly remarks about Jews. In my opinion, they have nothing to do with either religious anti-Semitism or racial anti-Semitism; they are simply assessments of the actions of people who explicitly described themselves as Jews and wanted to be seen as such.

The fact that the publication of a book that contains some harsh criticism of Jews coincides with the revived "Holocaust" debate is, of course, pure coincidence in view of the long time it took to write the work. Nevertheless, this current situation gives rise to a fundamental observation: if a historian deals critically with the deeds or misdeeds of Jewish members of the American plutocratic oligarchy, then this has nothing whatsoever to do with what was done to European Jewry during the Second World War. "Holocaust" would not cause any historian to delete a single line of a manuscript. Accordingly, no discussion of this point took place between D. L. Hoggan and myself, and of course no changes or additions were made to the finished text.

This book is therefore a document of fearless "independence from institutions of power and financial backers", solely committed to seeking and finding the truth. It wants nothing more than to once again pull a huge piece of historical reality out of the darkness - but also to make the living generation aware of it, sometimes not without a passionate appeal. The work is published sixty years after the first macabre climax of these hundred years of blindness, the Treaty of Versailles, which ruined the foundations of a reasonable world order for a long time, and forty years after the outbreak of the Second World War. No reader is likely to put this volume down without being deeply moved; however, he should not miss the fact that the author not only presents a shocking balance sheet, but also comes to a hopeful conclusion and shows a way out - a groping path out of the burdening darkness of world-historical blindness.

The publisher

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword by the editor

Preliminary remark: The task of the philosophy of history

1. Chapter: Galbraith's confession

Roosevelt's dictatorial presidency 5 -The road to the Great Depression 6-The role of Hjalmar Schacht 7- Hitler's brilliant restructuring of the German economy 10- Versailles 1919: a fairground of madness 12- England's conspiracy against Imperial Germany 14- Winston Churchill: the rise of a warmonger 15- **The** day of reckoning: Thursday, October 24, 1929 18-Hindenburg was the first German dictator 19- Keynes' economic prescriptions - first realized in Germany 21 -The American economic crisis lasted until the outbreak of war in 1941. October 1929 18-Hindenburg was the first German dictator 19- Keynes' economic recipes - first realized in Germany 21 -The American economic crisis lasted until the outbreak of war in 1941 22- Post-war America: false prosperity and the threat of bankruptcy 25- Galbraith's gloomy forecast for the USA in 1977 27

2. Chapter: The flip side of American history

The historical parallel 31-Modern Rome lies on the Potomac 32-The USA: a plutocratic oligarchy 34-The system came from England 35-Locke and Montesquieu, the spiritual fathers 36-The "founding fathers" did not want parties 39- The economic credo also came from the Old World: Quesnay and the school of physiocrats 41- Adam Smith's gospel of growth 45- Utilitarianism becomes the philosophy of intellectually underdeveloped America 48- Historiography in the USA: "court historians" and fearless critics 52- The finances of the "Founding Fathers" 56- George Washington and his plutocratic successors 57- The slave trade of the "Pilgrim Fathers" 59- The rich Dutch on the East Coast 60- Mammon ruled America from the beginning 63-The American "Revolution" was just a plutocratic civil war 64- Crying social injustice is rooted in the system 66- The emergence of the American two-party system 69- A nation of have-nots in a land of plenty 70-The Jewish immigration 71- "Boston Anglomania" 73-The true background of the North-South conflict 75- "Money was the measure of all things"; the case of Stephen Girard 77-Johann Jacob Astor, the super shark 80 -The gigantic plunder train 83-A cruel exploiter 85 -The average American and his masters 86- Marshall Field's raids 89-The insatiable railroad barons 91 - State violence against workers 93-The farmland being squandered on the rich 94- .. What do I care about the law!" 95

3. Chapter: LaFollette's attempt to clean up the Augean Stables USA

A man and an opportunity 97- Youthful years of an American tribune of the people 99-First political successes; US domestic policy in the 1980s 101-LaFollette in Congress: beginning the fight against the corrupt oligarchy 104-The "cleansing" of the state of Wisconsin 109- The appeal to the people of the USA 111- A root of evil: The corrupt electoral system 112-Teaching a people of ignorance 114-The Progressives claim Wisconsin; Roosevelt's imperialism 117-LaFollette in the US Senate; the struggle for reform at the federal level begins 120- The rise of Woodrow Wilson 122- George Record's fight against Wilson 123-LaFollette in the western United States: Fighting the Plunder and Destruction of Nature 125- Parallels in Europe 127- Exposing the Financial Oligarchy 131-The "Money Trust" does its biggest business: The US and World War I 123-The Federal Reserve System and Zionism 134-Lindbergh's father fights Wilson's war 136-LaFollette reaches for the US presidency 139- The Taft administration 141- Protective tariff policies and declining real incomes 144- The three critical decades of the US 146- Pro- gressivism beckons victory 149- LaFollette and big money 150- The reformer's candidacy 151- The oligarchy makes its preparations 153- Opening of the 1912 campaign; Roosevelt's betrayal 154- The stab in the back against America's great hope 157- Wilson and Henry Morgenthau Sr. 160- The false official Wilson image of the USA 162-The battle continues: LaFollette advocates for true US neutrality in the Senate 164-William Jennings Bryan 166-Wilson supports British imperialism 167-The appearance of Bernard Baruch 169-The revenge mentality of the American South 171-Baruch's origins and youth 174-The increasing importance of world Jewry 176- Wall-Street's "Lone Lion" 179- A fateful encounter 181- Baruch becomes Wilson's friend and chief advisor 184- LaFollette in the US se- nat: Fighting for the freedom of the Philippines, against Wilson's Mexican War and for American neutrality towards the European war 186-The arms shipments to the

Entente; LaFollette tries to mobilize the people against a US entry into the war 188- Desperate attempts to slow Wilson down 190-The ignition of war hysteria 192-The war is here; The banner of the six stalwart senators 195 - LaFollette does not bow to Wilson's terror 196 - The right of free speech in war 199 - The "Old Man" tries once again to save his country: The presidential candidacy of 1924 202- Wilson becomes mentally ill; Bernard Baruch as "Eider Statesman" 203

4. Chapter: American imperialism before Wilson

Hypocrisy on the slavery issue 207- Crusading agitation against the South 208- The founding of the Republican Party 209-Lincoln triggers the Civil War 211-The messianic character of American war policy 213- American ideology and world destruction 214-The beginning of an imperialist US foreign policy after the Civil War 216- First targets: Alaska and Mexico 217- The wars against Spain and Germany 219-US imperialism from Truman to Nixon 220- Interference in Mexico; Benito Juarez 222-The History of the Monroe Doctrine 224-Destruction of Emperor Maximilian of Mexico 227-Continuing US Intervention in the Southern Neighbor 229-The American Delusion of Superiority 231-Chauvinism and Missionary Consciousness 232-After the Civil War Victory, the Union Tangles with England 234- Lincoln and International Law 236-Ulysses Grant as President 237- The Arrangement with Imperialist England 238- Economic Consequences of the Civil War 241- Plans for aggression against the Spanish possessions 243- The extermination of the Indians 245- The foreign policy of Wilson and FDR was based on a much older tradition 246- Interference in Cuba and aggression against Colombia 247- The USA conquers the Kingdom of Hawaii 249- The invasion of Samoa 251- The Samoa agitation against Germany 252- Bismarck and the Americans 254- The economic basis of American world imperialism 256- For comparison: Russia's economic disadvantage 257- The United States, a country without natural enemies and strong neighbors 260- America's unprovoked aggressiveness 261- The Central American Union 262-The "Saltpeter Wars of 1879; the USA threatens Chile 263-Trade war **over** tainted pork 265- American attitudes towards foreigners 266-The Chinese in califorms 267-Social Darwinism, the philosophy of the plutocrats 269 -The teachings of Herbert Spencer 270-Captain Mahan, the prophet of naval warfare 270- The gospel of naval imperialism 272- Naval armaments and "dollar diplomacy" 273- Permanent expansion- across the globe and out into space 274- The Inter-American Conference of 1889/90 275-The Venezuelan border dispute 276-The USA takes sides against England 278- Cleveland against Salisbury 279-The US President under English pressure 281- Salisbury's reply to Cleveland 283- A diplomatic disaster 284- Kaiser Wilhelm II. as scapegoat 286-The imperialist alliance England-USA 287-Venezuela dropped in favor of the alliance with England 290- The "Maine Incident 291- The unprovoked aggression against Spain 292- The Monroe Dictrine loses its meaning 293- The USA takes over the completion of the Panama Canal 294- The Peace Treaty of Paris; the USA acquires colonies 295 - East Asia: The U.S. in England's wake 296- Americans force the "opening" of Japan in 1853 297- England and the Russo-Japanese War 299-Port Artbur 1904 and Pearl Harbor 1941 301-The Peace of Shimonoseki 302- Japan's Westernization program 304- Rearmament and militarization of Japan 305-The Russians in East Asia 307-Russia's conquests in China 309-British barbarism in China; the conquest of Peking in 1860 311-The "Unequal Treaties" 312-China's resistance to Western imperialism 313 - Empress Jehonola 315 - The Tsarist Empire falls into the English trap 317 - The Boxer Rebellion (1900) 318 - Intensified plundering of China 319 - England incites Japan against Russia 321 - The attack on Port Artbur 323 - Japan's brilliant strategic position **in** 1904 325 - Russia almost completely isolated 327 - Japan's success becomes Teddy Roosevelt's Roosevelt 327 - Japan's success becomes Teddy Roosevelt's Roosevelt. Japan's Success Becomes Teddy Roosevelt's Nightmare 328- The Kaneko Mission 330- Pro-Japanese Propaganda in America and England 332-The Siege of Port Arthur 333-The Undermining of Tsarist Rule 334- Japan's Rampage Against Russia 335- The Russian Defeat in Korea 337- The Fall of Port Arthur 339- The Naval Battle of Tsushima 341- Roosevelt Mediates the Peace of Portsmouth 342

5. Chapter: Wilson's presidency

The USA on the eve of the First World War 345- What America owed to the Europeans 346- Dryan's illusions about Wilson 348-From Wilson to Roosevelt 349-America 1913: A Giant Ready for Aggression and Expansion 351-The Imperialist Spirit of Alfred Mahan 352-The Anglo-Saxon Racial Delusion 354-The English Are Celts, Not Anglo-Saxons 356- Oswald Spengler and the Decline of the United States 357- The "Century of Peace 1814-1914" 358- America's "Wise Isolationism" Before Wilson 360- Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court 361-Anglo-Saxon and Jewish master race 363-Galton and the beginnings of eugenics 365 -Eugenic coercion in the USA 366- Warnings of mass Jewish immigration 367- Dr. Isidor Singer and the Christians of the USA 368- The power of B'nai B'rith 369- The battle for the youth of America 371- Establishing a spiritual foreign rule; Louis Brandeis 373- Judaism's claim to world leadership 374- Christ a forerunner of Marx? 376- David Lubin, an early American Zionist 377- Kaufmann Kohler's "ecumenical compromise 378- Ivan Bloch, Theodor Herzl's friend 380- Two opponents of imperial Germany: Alfred Fried and Maximilian Harden 381- Oscar Strauss, President of the New York Peace Society 383- Strauss' mission in the Ottoman Empire 385- Wilson and the Jewish goals 387- Christianity without Jesus? 389- The USA - a "Christian nation"? 390- Lord Halifax, a product of the Anglo-Saxon race myth 391- The teachings of Count Gobineau 393- Treitschke and Wagner 395- The struggle to restrict immigration to the USA 396- American criticism of Judaism 397- Madison Grant against the alienation of the USA 399- The decline of the American Christian churches 400- The 20th century begins under the sign of imperialism The 20th century begins under the sign of the imperialism of the great powers 401-The threat of aggression against the German Reich 402-The US naval build-up 403- The Morocco crisis of 1905 406- England working towards a European war 407-The era of American naval supremacy 408 -Outer and inner decline of the USA since the Second World War 410- Wilson's huge naval build-up 412- The USA under Teddy Roosevelt: A bomb that could explode at any time 413- The plutocrats seek foreign adventures 415- America's China imperialism 417- How Wilson became president 418- Wilson as leader of the U.S. 419- L. D. Brandeis and the Supreme Court 421- Brandeis as an advisor to Wilson 422- Wilson's diplomats 423-F. D. Roosevelt as Secretary of the Navy 425- Wilson's imperialist tendencies 427- Wilson's political and personal stature 428- Wilson publicly distances himself from the policies of his predecessors 430- Wilson's insincerity towards Mexico 432- Wilson's feud with Teddy Roosevelt 433- Wilson denies all aggressive intentions 435- Wilson and Anglo-American imperialism in China 436- Wilson and the American imperialism in China 436-Japan and the USA in the Wilson era 438-The gratuitous interference in the European war 440- The American people were not consulted 441- The US was never a democracy 442-Wilson overrides the will of the people 443- William Bryan and the Democratic Convention of 1916 444- Colonel House's European mission 446-The outbreak of war in Europe; Wilson's feigned neutrality 448- Wilson's and FDR's war policies-a ghostly parallel 449-England's secret ally 451-The submarine question 453-A presidential election with no real alternative 454-Wilson betrays the Kaiser 456-Franklin Roosevelt, the Super-Wilson 457- The "neutral" USA's arms trade 458- America's millionaires finance the Entente 459- Wilson's Mexican adventure 460- The USA invades Mexico 462- Wilson's game with Carranza and Villa 464 - Mexico's statehood is at stake 465 - The European war saves Mexico 466- Wilson and the Entente leaders 468 - American aggression in the West American aggression in the Western Hemisphere under Wilson (summary) 469- Germany's unrestricted submarine warfare 471- The USA declares war on the German Empire 473- A Senate committee investigates Wilson's machinations 20 years later 474- The American people did not want war 476- Wilson as war dictator of the USA 477- The military achievements of the Americans in Europe 479-The Fourteen Points as a propaganda tool 480-The German-Soviet peace treaty 481- Secret war aims of the Allies 483- Germany and the Fourteen Points 484- Wilson's aim: The overthrow of the German Reich 488- What the Germans "owe" to Wilson 489- Wilson's presidency- a disaster for the internal development of the USA 491- Wilson causes worldwide disaster 493- The armistice fraud of 1918 495- Wilson at Versailles 497- The US Senate rejects Wilson's peace 498- The President of the USA goes mad 499- Wilson's legacy 501

6. Chapter: Frank/in Roosevelt's presidency

The Wilson disciple's rise to power 505 - Roosevelt and Hopkins 507- Rapprochement with the Soviet Union 509- The Manchurian War of 1929 511- Hoover's disastrous trade policy 513- Hoover as scapegoat for the economic crisis 514- IFDR had run for office in 1928 ... 516-The real causes of Japan's expansionist policy 518-Roosevelt's responsibility for the war in the Pacific 520-Japan and the League of Nations 522- Franklin Roosevelt's youth and political rise 524- The secret alliance with Stalin 527- The third in the alliance: Winston Churchill 528- An American-Soviet conspiracy against Europe 530- The "Good Neighbor" of the Latin American states 533- Roosevelt's four dictatorial terms in office 535- Hitler and Roosevelt 536- Roosevelt threatens the Axis powers 538- Roosevelt's America on the eve of war 540

7. Chapter: Genius versus mediocrity (Ezra Pound and Frank Roosevelt)

The poet and the dictator 543-A decent, hopeless struggle 544-The genius from Idaho 545 -Pound in Europe 547-Inspired and promoter of the European cultural scene 550- Pound's political commitment 553-

Notes.....	565
------------	-----

Bibliography.....	593
-------------------	-----

List of persons.....	619
----------------------	-----

Preliminary remark

THE TASK OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

-Early civilizations with their strong religious drives do not need a philosophy of history, as they are armed with their own certainty as to the correctness of their aspirations in all areas. This was true for Greece before Socrates and for the West before Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz. From the late Roman Empire to the Baroque era, Augustine's theocracy theologically conveyed to the West the concept of dualism, which consisted of a global struggle between the forces of good and evil. Every Christian was endowed with the free will to be an agent rather than merely an object of history; and with a strangely dramatic vehemence that accompanies the rejection of all fatalism and belief in predestination, the individual was called upon to choose between these conflicting forces on a daily basis. There was also Augustine's adoption of the ancient Babylonian doctrine of original sin, which held that, despite Christian baptism, no human being could be completely free from an evil that was part of the essence of all life through human heredity. The Gospel of Jesus Christ, while not the first to introduce virtue into the world, made it possible for each individual to choose good over evil and provided the ultimate assurance that the power of virtue would triumph over the forces of evil.

The agreed definitions of what should be good and what should be evil changed from century to century. It was no particularly difficult feat when Peter Abälard, the 12th century Parisian scholastic philosopher, proved in his *Sie et Non* that theological authorities, including saints, contradicted each other on individual matters of moral doctrine, and the 13th century effort of Thomas Aquinas to reconcile said inconsistencies in his *Summa* was too ambitious to be crowned with success.

The contribution of the Germanic and Romance scholastic philosophers of the Middle Ages consisted - as with the Greeks before Socrates - in demonstrating the limits of human cognition through reason. It is a characteristic of human history that the emotional sphere - the homeland and

heartland of theology in every human breast - takes precedence over the cognitive sphere of human enlightenment, although the symbiosis of the two is just as indispensable for it as the cooperation of heart and brain in the human body. It was not the commandments of moral doctrine, according to which we set out to live, but rather the rootedness of the Christian attitude in the individual human heart that made our West the greatest cultural achievement of mankind.

It is still too early to prophesy what the future will bring to our West. We are too strong to be wiped out immediately by a blind century with its debt account of destruction outweighing the positive balance of achievements. But it is not too early to suggest that the West of the 20th century is sick, that religion has been hollowed out by an insidious operation of destruction, and that - without wishing to displace theology from its rights - a philosophy of history is needed to deter the leaders of the West from pursuing a path that has proved destructive.

The weakness of all previous philosophies of history-except that of Hegel-has been to emphasize the details of development at the expense of a disciplined subordination to analytical axioms, when the main concern of the philosophy of history should be to introduce and apply abstract variables. There are enough capable narrative historians, so no historical philosophy can afford to expend its energy on extrapolations of history and thus only enrich our sometimes abundant stock of historical accounts - as Vico, Michelet, Danilevski, Turner, Spengler, Toynbee and many others have done. It is not the philosophy, but the description that must form the accessory; and it is not the development report that must be the goal, but the novel analysis.

Every historian owes it to Klio, his muse, to be entertaining, just as every good historical report is an excellent story that happens to be based on truth. In our complex present, however, any philosophy of history that focuses on development seems too simplistic to be useful. The medieval period of the great French historical storytellers and mythologists such as Villehardouin, Joinville, Proissart or Comins has long been a thing of the past. It is not the task of the historical philosopher to tell us - whether in contemplative or urgent terms - where we have been in order to reveal where we are now or what will become of us. That would mean a violation of the autonomy of the realms, an encroachment on the territory of narrative history.

The task of the philosopher of history is rather to sharpen our world view and to captivate us with the correctness of his analytical-dialectical argumentation - and nothing else. This is not about anything absolute. It would be inappropriate for a profane historian, who is necessarily a relatively unknown person of no particular importance in his own right, to imagine that any philosophy of history should or could gain the kind of enduring impact and power that remains forever the domain of the great religions. A simple image from the 19th

century railroad era shows what is meant: the West is in a dark tunnel, and it now needs powerful locomotive lights to illuminate a stretch of track ahead. Without violating its boundaries, no purely secular philosophy of history should want to achieve more than this.

All historical philosophy is, *ab definitio*, a revisionist attempt to square the circle of frustration and suffering suffered in a particular age or historical moment - and no more. Quite unlike in practical medicine, where the work is at best only half done when a useful diagnosis is reached, the historical philosopher's diagnosis is not merely an interim result, but instead the ultimate goal. If the ray of light in the tunnel can be made to shine, then more capable and inventive contemporaries can carry out the work that needs to be done. The greatness of the West has been proven too often to justify the claim that it cannot be reaffirmed whenever necessary. What the West needs today is not just a passive awareness of what is wrong, but a firm grasp of what is right. Once this is achieved, the worst will be over. Whatever the strengths and weaknesses of modern theology, the current self-destructive and downward trend that is so afflicting the suffering West is solely a product of flawed mechanics in the world-loving historical process and not a shortcoming of religion.

The role of the philosophy of history is to introduce the parameters by which those errors in the historical process can be accurately described. The so-called moral aspect of philosophy (every philosophy must by definition have such an aspect) is simply to lay down principles for defending the general welfare of the West and its people in order to overcome the currently dominant selfish claims of presumptuous special interests, with their mind-numbing and soul-killing abandonment of truth, decency and *elan vital* - the precious moral, political and socio-economic trinity without which our traditional West is nothing. Make no mistake: the special interests described in this study want to liquidate the West once and for all - as James Burnham discovered to his amazement when he read the reviews of his work *Suicide of the West* (New York, 1964) in the US media. Burnham was told that he was right in his assertion that the prevailing domestic and foreign policies of the NATO states would wipe out the West, but that the eventual destruction of the West had become necessary as a sacrifice for the radical humanist-messianic utopia of a perfect humanity in a united world, which was also destined to end the historical process as such.

The following remarks must necessarily go far beyond Burnham and his critics. They only claim to be original in one respect: in the diagnosis of a very specific disease of the West.

First chapter

GALBRAITH'S ADMISSION

Roosevelt's dictatorial presidency

Grenville Clark¹ admitted in 1958 that Frank Delano Roosevelt had been a puppet of the U.S. plutocratic oligarchy, composed of non-Jews and members of world Jewry, of which Clark himself was a member, and that Roosevelt had been driven into foreign policy adventures by her and with outside help from England's professional warmongers Winston Churchill and Anthony Eden-this after Clark in 1937, after Roosevelt's triumphant re-election in November 1936, Clark had sabotaged his staffing of the U.S. Supreme Court (increasing³ the number of justices from 9 to 15) and Roosevelt's intended purge of Democratic Party conservatives to run in the 1938 congressional and gubernatorial elections-a move designed to turn the entire Democratic Party into a monolithic, collectivist weapon in the hands of the dictator FDR

The revelation of another powerful member of the Harvard establishment, John Kenneth Galbraith⁵, was more typical than it was accurate in revealing the source of criminal motivation in the Harvardian Roosevelt. Galbraith headed the all-powerful Price Control Board during World War II for the dictator Roosevelt, who had secretly hoped since the days of Wilson to become a brilliant wartime president, and Galbraith was a far more intelligent man than his master in the White House⁶ For two decades after World War II, Galbraith was synonymous with the complacency of the American establishment - thanks to the self-satisfaction and serenity of his essays and books, and especially his best-seller *The Affluent Society*⁷. The same Galbraith then admitted in 1977 that the long-term, hopelessly rotten consequences of the Anglo-American, permanent-inflationist Keynesian economic revolution had been perfectly clear to him from 1943, that his optimistic work of 1958 had been nothing but whistling in Dixie, and that he had never believed after the Second World War that international plutocratic rule and capitalism should or could be saved.

Galbraith - like most of the Harvard and Columbia University brain trust that slavishly supported Roosevelt for more than twelve years from 1933 to 1945 - was always an activist scientist who emphasized public relations at the expense of the seriousness of his scientific output. Galbraith's 1977 treatise purports to reveal all the essential secrets about himself and Keynes (1883-1946), who was a personally down-and-out English economist and married a pleasure-seeking Russian dancer. Clearly, Galbraith never really understood that Keynes - like himself - was a plagiarist and never an original thinker. Accordingly, Galbraith attributed to his English colossus with feet of clay a creative originality that he never possessed. The creative groundwork for the first of the Keynesian books so praised by Galbraith was done by Jan Smuts of South Africa, for the second, the German economist Friedrich August Lutz. Smuts and Keynes spent a long time together in Paris, where they analyzed the hypocrisy and incompetence of the Allied peacemakers, and it was the Burmese soldier¹¹ and politician Smuts who first nailed down the Versailles Treaty of 1919 as a terrible economic and political monstrosity.

Lutz, the intellectual and creative son of a wealthy German brewery owner, studied economics in Tübingen, Heidelberg and Berlin. His doctoral thesis of 1925 was published under the title *Der Streit um den Kapitalbegriff* and contained the germ of the later Keynesian doctrine. In Germany in the 1920s and 1930s, while teaching at the University of Freiburg and conducting research at the Walter Eucken Institute, Lutz had to contend with the difficulty that German theoretical economics had ossified into conservatism as a result of the decade of terrible monetary experience that culminated in 1924 with the collapse of the once magnificently sound Reichsmark and its replacement by the new Rentenmark currency. While a few corrupt speculators, especially foreign Jews, made phenomenal profits in this abrupt transition from one currency to another, millions of decent and industrious investors lost their savings, including the money invested in the war bonds of the First World War. Closely related to this destruction of traditional civic virtues was the subsequent flourishing of left and right-wing political radicalism when the US-manufactured Great Depression hit the economy of the Weimar Republic-only five years after hard-working workers and industrious middle-classes had been bled dry in the mumbo-jumbo of currency change (a brutal experience that other Western societies, such as those of France, Italy, England or the US, never experienced). The English economist Ellis Barker had shown in a book before the war that German workers saved four times as much as English workers, and now, in the Germany of 1930, it looked as if diligence and financial solidity were being particularly punished. Quite naturally and rightly, the blame for this tragedy was placed on

the corrupt International of Money. The full story of the crisis was later told in *Geld und Währung*, a collection of Lutz's writings published by the Walter Eucken Institute in 1962.

The RoHe Hjalmar Schacht

The rigidly doctrinaire economist who dominated German theoretical economics after 1924 was Hjalmar Schacht, and Lutz shared Keynes' and Galbraith's contempt for Schacht's incompetence, even though the latter was a master at publicity campaigns for his own glorification and at taking credit for the practical achievements and research results of others. Schacht, for example, was falsely credited with saving the German monetary economy in 1924, when in reality it was the achievement of Dr. Karl Helfferich, a man of splendid patriotism and the purest character; and even in the 1930s, when Schacht enjoyed a reputation as a cunning international master negotiator, he based his reputation on the achievements of others and organized a powerful lobby within the framework of German financial and industrial organizations, which worked exclusively for him. Schacht's position in Germany during the 1920s and 1930s was greatly strengthened by his influential friends in England - Montagu Norman, who headed the Bank of England¹³, and Winston Churchill, the Tory troublemaker who did more damage to the then British Empire than any other person between 1914 and 1945. Keynes and Galbraith agreed, on irrefutable evidence, that between 1929 (when Schacht recommended and imposed the Young Plan on Germany for reparations) and 1945 (when Germany capitulated, largely as a result of the restrictions Schacht had imposed on the German military economy in the crucial years 1936-1941), that Schacht had done more to undermine Germany than any other individual in the Weimar Republic or under Hitler, and this through his appalling combination of incompetence, boundless need for recognition, tactical machismo and obnoxious, unpatriotic character.

Like Keynes, Lutz had also condemned the dishonest, artificial efforts of England and America between 1925 and 1928 to give the British pound sterling an arbitrary and far greater value than it could have in reality¹⁶, and both scholars quickly recognized that it was this effort in the first place that brought about the unnecessary collapse of the United States securities market in 1929.

The US economic crisis - a storm warning for the whole world since 1929 - hit Germany with cruel severity in 1931, after the Allies had used economic sanctions to block the Weimar German Chancellor Heinrich Brüning's project for an Austro-German customs union, and after they had ruined the prestigious Wiener Kreditanstalt, the largest independent credit society in Central Europe,

with the open assistance of the Rothschilds. After the damage had been done, the Allies had the temerity to ask the International Court of Justice in The Hague for a ruling that Brüning's initiative constituted an illegal and criminal threat to international law - a purely political decision that flies in the face of all prevailing legal usage. The Allies themselves had been under a legal obligation since 1920 to convene an international disarmament conference in Geneva immediately, but had delayed it with excuses until 1932 and then immediately allowed it to fail, even though some of the delegates remained in Geneva until 1934 without any purpose.

Allied harassment had pushed the weak and corrupt Weimar Republic to the wall. After 1931, the only hope for its political survival was to find and develop some kind of new program for economic recovery, which had to be based primarily on aid in Germany itself. Lutz advocated public debt in Germany in order to restore economic growth - just as Keynes was to advocate in England the following year and Galbraith in the USA in 1933. But the "hunger chancellor" Brüning (like Churchill, who was hounded out of office for eight years in 1931) pursued an antiquated deflationary policy in the deceptive hope that everything would now proceed according to the cold mechanics of liberal-utilitarian laws as outlined by Adam Smith, David Ricardo and John Mill in the 18th and 19th centuries: The German economy would purge itself of the disease of the preceding currency devaluation of 1925-1929-including the ruinous 9 percent bonds in the US-through temporary massive unemployment and would regain its health after a valiant period of stoically endured suffering by the people. Unlike the impoverished and helpless masses of earlier times, however, the modern German was not willing to put up with this grim kind of maltreatment a la Maltbus. Fifty percent of the German industrial workforce now found themselves unemployed only a few years after the incredible suffering of the decade 1914-1924. The communist KPD was on the rise in 1932 with 100 Reichstag deputies. The patience of the long-suffering Germans was finally exhausted.

Had Brüning followed Lutz's moderate and mildly inflationary program - which later became known to the world in an exacerbated form as Keynesianism - the Weimar Republic could easily have gained a new lease on life to weather the economic storm. When the world economic crisis became acute in France in 1934 - almost five years later¹⁸ than in the USA, Germany, England and Italy - the Third Republic weathered the severe crisis of 1934-1938 and might well have lasted until the end of the 20th century had not the British Foreign Secretary Lord Halifax pushed it into the highly unwelcome Second World War fabricated in England.

HitZer's brilliant restructuring of the German economy

When Hitler came to power in Germany in 1933, he immediately and successfully adopted a Lutz-Keynes type method, with some crucially important additional advantages offered by the Reichstag's Enabling Act of 1933 and the salutary National Socialist tenet of public interest over self-interest. This indicated that Hitler was able and willing to protect the German people from the ravages of the greedy plutocratic special interests that tend to run riot in capitalist societies in times of emergency and crisis¹⁹. Galbraith explained in his 1977 treatise how Hitler overcame the German economic crisis once and for all during 1933-5 without resorting to excessive armaments or destruction of agricultural production or any of the other costly measures that Roosevelt's New Deal employed in the United States at the same time. USA at the same time. Hitler demonstrated to an astonished world a restored German economy in a state of normalcy that could only be found elsewhere under the populist reform regime of Huey Long in the small US state of Louisiana.

Hitler's political and socio-economic victories in Germany were achieved through a combination of idealism and simple logic - and against the incessant objections of German professional economists. The successes of the Third Reich infuriated Schacht, the self-centered German chief economist and highly influential business lobbyist who had torpedoed the Weimar Republic in 1931 by leaving the German Democratic Party and going over to Hitler. Like Admiral Wilhelm Canaris in the German Abwehr, like State Secretary Ernst von Weizsäcker in the Foreign Office and like Chief of Staff Ludwig Beck, Schacht was a born conspirator who automatically placed his own ambition above the weal and woe of others and who, after 1935, attempted to torpedo Hitler in a clandestine way to torpedo Hitler by strangulating Germany's readiness for war and allying himself with a high-ranking treasonous elite who held power in the Third Reich - as under all German regimes before and after - thanks to their secrecy. This group, to which Schacht so eagerly adhered, has been the scourge of German history for the last 2000 years. The only German leaders of stature in recent times to have survived the wrath of the treasonous elite were Frederick the Great and Bismarck. The former was spared because he was a pro-French and anti-German particularist, and the latter got away with it because he made his decisive moves with incredible speed in the 1866-1871 period - afterwards, during twenty years as imperial chancellor, Bismarck failed with most of his domestic programs and was still persecuted in retirement²⁰.

Schacht, the conservative economist, and droves of his equally deflation-minded colleagues - who feared any kind of public debt or inflation after the financial collapse of 1923 - monopolized the scene of German economics during the Third Reich, much to the regret of Hitler and Göring. Schacht disagreed with and blocked some of Göring's excellent economic policies, while retaining his position as president of the German Reichsbank until 1939.

Schacht was acquitted at the main Nuremberg trial in 1946, but Göring, who had always been in favor of peace according to an affidavit sent to Lord Justice Lawrence by Lord Halifax, was convicted. Schacht's continued sabotage after 1935 closed Göring down and prevented him from functioning normally in the war imposed on Germany by Lord Halifax in 1939²².

Throughout the war, Schacht was active in the treasonous elite within Germany, who tried many times unsuccessfully to kill Hitler - although after Schacht's enthusiastic reception for Hitler at the Anhalter Bahnhof in July 1940, one might have assumed that he was Hitler's most ardent admirer in the world. Schacht's overtly treasonous actions after 1935 were known to some of the senior German officials who admitted to being loyal to Hitler even after the war, yet who never warned him because they-like their brethren in the German military establishment of World War II-had war-distorted notions of group loyalty to criminal colleagues rather than normal patriotic views²³.

Thanks to Schacht and his ilk, there was no longer room in Germany for a brilliantly creative national economist like Lutz, who emigrated in 1938, at the height of Germany's fading glory (after Hitler had ended Germany's economic crisis, but before Lord Halifax had embroiled Germany in that gratuitous global conflict, World War II, which neither Hitler nor the German people ever longed for). Lutz became a professor of money and banking at Princeton University for fifteen years, and for the last six years, beginning in 1947, conducted an advanced seminar every semester on the infamous Marshall Plan - that Jewish program of postwar American plutocratic imperialism to permanently infiltrate the nations of Western Europe while enabling the plutocratic privateers to drag away as much as possible from those parts of Europe not yet firmly under Soviet control²⁴.

Lutz fled the USA, which Henry Miller (born 1891) aptly named *The Air-Conditioned Nightmare*²⁵. In 1953, he accepted the position of senior professor of economics at the University of Zurich, where he gave a series of fascinating lectures to a large number of students²⁶^

In dozens of his essays in international economic journals, Lutz tried - in vain, as it turned out - to prevent the Anglo-American supporters of super-inflation from ruining the economy of the non-Soviet part of the West "by hook or by crook". Not only did Lutz see his own earlier ideas become known in a distorted form as the Keynesian method, he also outlived Keynes by many years and witnessed the further decline of the West in the economic sector.

Versailles 1919: a fairground of madness

Galbraith recalled that Keynes, in describing the Versailles "fair of madness

"27 of 1919, indulgently dismissed President Woodrow Wilson - the highest-ranking American tool of Zionism and Bolshevism - as a "blind and deaf Don Quixote". Of Clemenceau, Keynes wrote briefly but aptly that he "had one illusion: France, and one disappointment: humanity". With the chief architect of the Versailles Treaty madness, England's World War II dictator David Lloyd George, whom he portrayed as a throwback to a primitive age, Keynes became increasingly poetic: "How am I to convey to the reader who does not know him any accurate impression of this extraordinary figure of our time, this siren, this goat-footed bard, half-human visitor to our age from the witch-infested, enchanted forests of Celtic antiquity?"²⁸

No wonder Keynes was both severely rebuked and deliberately slandered by the Times of London for having "done the Allies a disservice for which their enemies will doubtless be grateful"²⁹. Keynes had dared to report at least a small part of the sordid truth about the Treaty of Versailles. His condemnation by The Times, the official organ of the Permanent Foreign Office³⁰, meant the end of his official career in England. He had violated a hallowed³¹ principle in modern England that British officials are not allowed - not allowed by the Anglo-Norman power oligarchy that rules with ruthless severity behind the democratic façade - to make public statements about controversial issues that are also true. Lying for one's country is compulsory medicine for all members of the corrupt English establishment. As long as this mendacious, disgraceful state of affairs continues, no British government, Labour or Tory, will admit with Fouché-like candor that the most important decisions of British foreign policy in the 20th century were something worse than crimes: gross blunders.

Unfortunately, the U.S. officialdom has been under the same duress since Wilson, and worse, since Franklin Roosevelt, the presidents themselves have become the chief liars. Not a single president since FDR has dared to say an honest word about American and British foreign policy in the 20th century. The Anglo-American Confederacy is eager to justify its global political crimes and blunders, and that means they would rather let the West crumble to dust before these world-champion liars admit the truth, let alone explain it.

As Galbraith said, "When they are wrong, great men resent it most when someone steps out of line."³² It must also be noted, however, that these so-called great men were great only in the sense that they had power, and it is only they against whom the biblical commandment is directed: "Speak the truth to the powerful."

During the two decades after 1919, Keynes was successful as an insurance director in the private sector, but was "kept out of public affairs. He had not played by the rules".³³

Although barred from public office, Keynes made his voice heard. He enjoyed exposing the ruinous blunders of Winston Churchill, England's most

influential and bloodthirsty warmonger. Galbraith recalled that "Churchill was responsible in 1925 for the most disastrous blunder of any government in modern economic history. It was Keynes who made it famous"³⁴.

England's conspiracy against imperial Germany

Throughout the 1990s, the widely circulated English newspaper Saturday Review had repeatedly insisted - in the war-mongering style of Cato against ancient Carthage - that every Englishman would become rich if only Germany - England's most important trading partner! - was destroyed. It was once again the old story of the slaughter of the goose that laid golden eggs for England in the form of lucrative trading profits. From the resignation of Prime Minister Lord Salisbury in 1902 to the Treaty of Versailles in 1919, England's leaders pursued the one ultimate goal of *Germaniam delendam esse* with obsessive and xenophobic single-mindedness. The eventual outcome of England's success in this insane enterprise was foreseeable and was discussed by Keynes in his 1919 book, namely: the economic ruin of England and almost all of Europe.

A typical example: Scotland, conquered and subjugated by England in 1746 after eight centuries of Scottish-English wars, bore a disproportionate share of the economic burden of British imperialism in the 20th century. Twenty percent of Scotland's entire population was forced to emigrate during the first ten years after the signing of the Treaty of Versailles due to dire economic hardship. England had spent hundreds of thousands of tons of Russian human flesh, the bloom of French men and billions of American dollars to bring a victorious end to a war against Germany into which France and Russia had been tricked and pushed after their secret military agreements of 1904 and 1907, as well as a neighbor of France, Belgium³⁵. England itself made more sacrifices this time than usual in its countless wars, which it repeatedly brought about in the interests of British imperialism and always with the intention that other, less fortunate peoples should bear the brunt of the struggle³⁶.

England's secret military conspiracy against Germany since 1902 was in itself no more evil or unchristian than the myriad of its secret military conspiracies against China, India, America, South Africa, Egypt, the Sudan, France, Spain, Holland, Denmark-Norway or Russia - to name but a few of the unfortunate victims before 1902. But none of the earlier conflicts, not even the 22-year campaign at the time of the French Revolution and Napoleon I, exhausted England's economy to a comparable extent.³⁷ The once so clever English had made a mistake in their calculations for the First World War: not only had England destroyed the main source of its trade, the German market, in 1919, it had also sold more than half of its worldwide foreign investments in an

overzealous rush to cash in, on which it had lived in luxury for generations. Every international merchant or banker of 1914 knew that England, despite its unfavorable balance of trade (imports far exceeded exports), was becoming steadily richer thanks to enormous usurious returns on foreign investments. In 1919 it became obvious - as Keynes was told by Smuts - that the simultaneous decline of trade and investment - the two pillars of British strength - had weakened the world's number one military power, England.

Winston Churchill: the rise of a warmonger

Chorebill earned fame in all modern wars, although he never allowed himself to serve on the battlefield in his 90 years of life. In 1897, he delighted in playing gentleman observer to General Weyler and his Spanish troops as they chased the insurgents through the jungles of Cuba. This was a few months before the outbreak of the Spanish-American War of 1898. Chorchili then also had great fun playing the newspaper reporter in South Africa when the diminutive Lord Roberts mustered 300,000 British regular Empire troops to crush the Boer pioneer republics of Transvaal and Orange Free State - by every dirty means imaginable including artillery bombardment of Boer treks, consisting mainly of women and children, the burning of all Boer farms along with the harvested grain, the rounding up of all Boer cattle and, of course, the total application of the usual English concentration camps where, according to official British figures, 10,000 Boer women and 20,000 Boer children perished of starvation and disease³ 8. Churchill also loved to take in the grim scenes of British conquest in India and Africa on peacetime military tours. He was then a bungler and bungler in the early First World War as civilian Parliamentary First Lord of the Admiralty, whose careless and overconfident immaturity made possible the brilliant German victories at Antwerp, Belgium (1914)³⁹ and Gallipoli, Turkey (1915-1916)⁴⁰ . Before the inevitable defeat at Gallipoli, Seelord Fisher ensured Churchill's dismissal by threatening to resign himself if he did not. Unlike Churchill, the seelord had military talent, and Churchill's many personal relationships, which alone had made his political career possible, proved insufficient in the dispute with Fisher to avert Churchill's downfall. Before he left his post⁴¹, Churchill arranged the sinking of the munitions-laden British Cunard auxiliary cruiser and passenger ship Lusitania in May 1915, with the loss of more than a thousand British and American lives - an unsuccessful attempt to drive the USA into the First World War during the first year of hostilities⁴².

Even before the outbreak of war in 1914, Churchill had done everything in his power to bring about a war between England and Germany. After the

infamous and irresponsibly warmongering public speech⁴³ by cabinet member Lloyd George at the Mansion House in London in July 1911, Churchill and Lloyd George strove mightily to turn the relatively harmless Second Morocco Crisis into a global war - and almost succeeded⁴⁴. Had the two succeeded in unleashing a world war, it would have been a disaster for British imperialism because - as documents from the old Tsarist archives, published by the Soviets in 1938, reveal - Russia, still suffering badly from the 1905 defeat at the hands of Britain's ally Japan, would not have supported Britain and France in a military conflict, making a quick German victory over France inevitable. In fact, had Germany between 1902 and 1914, instead of pursuing a consistent peace policy, copied the British and, like them, sought war as a means of national policy, there would have been many opportunities for a quick victory.

Germany could have come clean militarily: Not only in 1911, when the professional warmongers Churchill and Lloyd George only narrowly missed their war, but as early as 1905 Germany could have settled its score with the French revanchist clique⁴⁵ in a successful pre-emptive war - when Russia was on the ground after revolution and military defeat - as well as in 1909 during the Bosnian crisis⁴⁶ or even in 1912, when pan-Slavist Russian diplomats led by the envoy Hartwig in Belgrade unleashed the so-called First Balkan War⁴⁷.

In short, German virtue before 1914 played into the hands of English wickedness before 1914. But this did not prevent the same Englishmen from getting the other Allies in 1919 to impose on Germany, in Article 231 of the Treaty of Versailles, the sole responsibility for the First World War, which had been made exclusively in London. For the English gravediggers of Morocco, what they did to Belgium⁴⁸ was just a confusion in their shameful war conspiracy, the success of which in 1914 robbed a human generation of the West of its hopes for a better and more civilized life.

Although it was Lord Grey who started the First World War and his cousin Lord Halifax who started the Second World War⁴⁹, Churchill was England's most outspoken and public-spirited warmonger. In 1925, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, the same Churchill was stubbornly and blindly determined to restore the pre-war exchange rate of 4.86 dollars for the ailing pound sterling. He secured the assistance of the wealthy US Treasury Secretary Andrew Mellon and other US plutocrats for his euphoric scheme, who should have known better had they not had the blind spot that Thomas Jefferson described as "Anglomania". An old English proverb says: If wishes were horses, beggars would ride. But another states: If beggars have horses, they ride them to death. These are the proverbs that explain the misadventures of Churchill in 1925, the worst and most unprincipled scoundrel ever to enter British politics. It was easy for Keynes to clip the wings of such a bumbling miscreant. As Galbraith put it, "The man who suffered most from Keynes's impartiality was Winston

The day of reckoning: Thursday, October 24, 1929

Galbraith recalled that England "reacted favorably to Churchill's announcement in the House of Commons that he would return to the gold standard. The New York Times headline proclaimed that he had 'roused Parliament and nation to great enthusiasm'. Keynes, on the other hand, wrote an open letter asking why Churchill was doing >such a foolish thing<"s^

Churchill's bravura move in 1925 made England's goods more expensive abroad than those of its competitors. This immediately led to lower wages and higher unemployment across England. British workers were galvanized by this loss into the famous general strike of May 1926. Shabby regressive taxation, meagre wages and chronic unemployment were a far cry from the Hornes Fitfor Heroes that Churchill's friend and co-conspirator, wartime dictator Lloyd George, had promised the downtrodden English masses not even ten years earlier. Churchill demanded - and quickly got - harsh, violent repression with bloodshed against the strikers, many of whom were World War II veterans. This vileness was, of course, only the short-term effect. The real catastrophe caused by Churchill's stupidity, which shook the world, came a few years later, in 1929.

Galbraith recalled that " in 1927 the outflow of gold to the USA was already alarming. Therefore, in that year Montagu Norman, head of the Bank of England, together with Hjalmar Horace Greeley Schacht, the head of the Reichsbank⁵² , traveled to New York to try to get it back. There, together with Charles Rist of the Banque de France, they asked the Federal Reserve to lower its interest rates, increase the volume of credit and thus stimulate monetary policy. The lower interest rates would stem the outflow of gold to America. Cheaper money meant more credit, higher American prices, less competition in England and elsewhere from American goods and better business for Europeans in the USA. The Americans complied with these wishes - and this was the first step that is thought to have triggered the great securities speculation of 1927-1929: the cheap money was used to buy stocks, quite differently than intended. The day of reckoning was Thursday, October 24, 1929. "⁵³

The effects of the American Great Depression (1929-1941) spread like the plague around the world. Hard-working Germany, unlike England, had become relatively prosperous again during four all-too-short years (1925-1929); but with ruinous reparations payments on its back until 1988 (Dawes Plan 1924, Young Plan 1929) and with the corrupt and servile Weimar Republic's unnecessary dependence on high-yield bonds in the USA, the particularly vulnerable Germans became, within two years, the nation that suffered most in the world from the economic crisis emanating from America:

Germany was hit about twice as hard as the USA. Two years after the Social Democratic and Marxist Chancellor Müller had boasted in 1928 that the Weimar Republic stood on a foundation of granite, no German coalition government was able to obtain the normally indispensable vote of confidence from the Reichstag (the sine qua non of all functioning parliamentary cabinet governments).

Hindenburg was the first German dictator

The aged President Paul von Hindenburg (1847-1934), always susceptible to any corrupt influence, became de jure dictator of Germany.

This was based on the emergency decree right contained in Article 48 of the Weimar Constitution⁵⁴ This Article 48 had been inserted in 1919 by Hugo Preuß, the Jewish creator of the Weimar Constitution, and the National Assembly had approved it - as well as the Treaty of Versailles. Their faith that Germany would function according to the so-called democratic process was small, and the majority coalition of Weimar was intent on keeping its place at the fleshpots of power - by any means possible. After the terror and intimidation by the Marxists in the 1919 elections, it was generally known that those elected in Weimar were not a true representation of the German people, but they hoped that Dr. Preuss's cunning ploy would enable them to keep the German people in their grip forever.

None of the other so-called modern liberal parliamentary constitutions had such an Article 48 - this simple emergency exit into the world of Marxist despotism. It would be a gross and blatant confusion of cause and effect to hold Adolf Hitler responsible for the metamorphosis of a sham democracy into an open dictatorship that took place in Germany in 1930.

Hitler and his NSDAP⁵⁵ garnered only 2.8 percent of the vote in the Reichstag election of 1928-the last before the Wall Street securities market collapsed in 1929. No one can deny that there were three other German chancellors before Hitler-namely Heinrich Brüning, Franz von Papen and Kurt von Schleicher-who ruled in the name of the German dictator, Reich President von Hindenburg, behind the umbrella of Article 48, which Brüning had persuaded a willing Hindenburg to use⁵⁶ Brüning was then dropped by Hindenburg in 1932 because political detractors had falsely convinced him that the left-of-center leader was planning to undermine aid to the East⁵⁷. As soon as Brüning was out⁵⁸, two unscrupulous rivals, Papen and Schleicher, fought bitterly to succeed him. Neither of them had the slightest following in the country, but that did not bother them. Although Papen was the first to become chancellor, Schleicher succeeded in ousting him from Hindenburg's favor for good in 1932. Meanwhile, both Papen and Schleicher had intimidated Hitler's

former financial backers to stop donating money to the NSDAP - while funds continued to flow to the German Reds. The result was that in November 1932, at the fourth costly general election in this year of bitter poverty for the mass of Germans, the NSDAP's share of the vote fell significantly, while the vote for the German Communist Party continued to rise steeply - as had been the case without interruption since 1929. Now Mrs. von Papen, as the lady of the German plutocratic aristocracy, harboured her personal fanatical hatred of Hitler - whom she hated more than any other person in the world - but at the same time Franz von Papen had become so furious with Schleicher, who, with superior political strategy and tactics, had nested himself solely in Hindenburg's favour, that he was willing to use any means to destroy Schleicher's political career. He therefore used the decline in the NSDAP vote and the KPD's election victory as a pretext to convince Hindenburg and his family that Schleicher had to be dropped and Hitler appointed in order to prevent an imminent Communist seizure of power in Germany. Papen knew that the rich snob Hindenburg rejected Hitler because of his origins in the Austrian lower middle class and denounced him as the >Bohemian corporal<59 He therefore promised Hindenburg that he could keep Hitler under control as chancellor by securing 12 of the 15 cabinet posts for the DNVP (Deutschnationale Volkspartei)60 . Hindenburg deluded himself that he could use the hated NSDAP and at the same time keep it under control and remain dictator of Germany for at least another seven years - and on January 30, 1933, he appointed Hitler Reich Chancellor and Papen Vice Chancellor.

It is a perversity that cannot be surpassed when some political scientists insist on speaking of a "seizure of power" instead of a seizure of power61 by Hitler. The real seizure of power under the Weimar system had already been carried out by Hindenburg and Brüning in 1930. The only difference was that in 1933 Germany was literally on the verge of collapse62 and that Hitler - unlike his three predecessors - procured the dictatorial power of the senile Hindenburg by legal and constitutional means with the help of the Reichstag's Enabling Act and used it to curb both the German Communists and the German economic crisis.

Surely no one would argue that Hitler achieved this political goal of his at the age of 43 by persuading Churchill to adopt the gold standard in 1925 and convincing Mellon to go along with it, and by inciting Brüning, Papen and Schleicher to pursue a feeble deflationary policy while Germany collapsed around them. And yet the conventional historical application of the law of cause and effect must lead to the conclusion that Hitler's appointment as Chancellor of Germany, like the outbreak of the First World War in 1914 and the Second World War in 1939, was in the final analysis "made in England".

Galbraith recalled that Keynes was not properly recognized in England until

Lord Halifax successfully triggered the Second World War in 1939. Before that, "Westminster and Whitehall responded to the crisis by simply ignoring the steady stream of expert advice coming from John Maynard Keynes."

Keynes' economic recipes - first realized in Germany

"Keynes was fully aware of what had to happen. He demanded that the government should go into debt and spend the money. Borrowing caused the money supply to grow. It was the government that spent the money, and then it would be spent again by the workers and other recipients of money. The government spending and re-spending by the payees would ensure that the thing did not fizzle out prematurely. Not only was money created, but its use was enforced".⁶³

Hitler's socio-economic policies during the three years after his appointment "were everything a Keynesian could wish for. From 1933 onwards, Hitler ran up debts and spent the money - and he did it generously, just as Keynes would have recommended. In view of unemployment, this also seemed obvious. Initially, the money was mainly spent on civilian purposes: on the railroad, shipping canals, administrative buildings and the Reich autobahn. Foreign exchange controls then deterred intimidated Germans from taking their money abroad, and those with rising incomes from spending too much on imported goods.

Unemployment in Germany was eliminated towards the end of 1935. In 1936, purchasing power was available again, which made it possible to raise prices. Wages also began to rise. In this way, a ceiling was set for both wages and prices, and this also worked. In the late 1930s, Germany had full employment with stable prices. This was something absolutely unique for industrialized countries⁶⁴. "

The American economic crisis lasted until the outbreak of war 1941

Keynes observed how Hitler acted effectively while England moved mindlessly in its own crisis. Keynes also bet that the US would be more willing than Britain to follow Hitler's imaginative example.

However, he grossly overestimated the intellectual capacity and abilities of American New Deal President Frank Roosevelt. Although FDR had won the 1932 presidential election by accusing President Herbert Hoover of careless and excessive spending⁶⁵, once elected he no longer cared about his own words: During the so-called Hundred Days of Emergency Legislation and

Appropriations following his inauguration on March 4, 1933, he spent vast sums of pumped money in all directions that the moderate Hoover would not have dreamed of touching on constitutional grounds alone. Keynes indulged in wishful thinking that it would be possible to curb this mindless waste and published an open letter to Roosevelt in the New York Times with a wealth of well-intentioned advice. After a period of time to allow this information to penetrate deeply enough, Keynes traveled to America in 1933 and visited FDR, who had completed his only course of study in economics at Harvard with moderate success. After a single, purely personal conversation with Roosevelt, Keynes confessed to American journalists that he had "supposed the President was more educated in economics".⁶⁶

Although FDR's colossal ignorance in economic matters also ruled out Keynes' immediate success in official Washington, he did later enter the USA through a side door, namely via the universities - particularly Harvard and Columbia - after the publication of his book on general economic theory⁶⁷ in 1936. Before Roosevelt managed to provoke the reluctant Japanese into a last resort of self-defense, the strike on Pearl Harbor⁶⁹ on December 7, 1941, through a series of aggressive, war-like actions⁶⁸, both the American Federal Reserve and the president's entourage were firmly in Keynesian hands.

An insurmountable inertia on the part of the American plutocratic oligarchy made it difficult to apply Keynes' system to ease the suffering of the people in crisis - an application similar to Hitler's 1933 measures in Germany - but these American plutocratic miscreants have always, and especially as recently as World War I, been excited and electrified when they could turn away from overdue domestic reforms to participate - indirectly, of course - in the pleasures of a mass killing. When the US was once again lied and deceived into war in 1941, against the better judgment of more than 80 percent of its citizens (results of Roper and Gallup opinion polls), the appetite quickly came with the food, and the predominantly Jewish-run War Information Office flooded the ignorant American booboisie¹⁰ with blatant misinformation to make them forget how they had been deceived by FDR - and the twelve-year-old swamp of American economic stagnation was drained by the deus ex machina of modern totalitarian warfare. For FDR, who had a taste for the possibility of destroying the entire civilian population of Germany, the prospects became even more tantalizing during the final weeks before Pearl Harbor: The secret German treasonous elite, who maintained direct contact with FDR through Adam Trott zu Solz in 1941, had managed to scupper the agreed German operational plan against the Soviet Union despite Hitler's early brilliant victories and Stalin's panic⁷. The German secret treasonous elite worked ceaselessly and tirelessly against Hitler, especially in 1940-1941, when it seemed very likely that Germany could emerge

victorious from a short war without catastrophic bloodshed. Hitler was given poison at German headquarters in July 1941, which incapacitated him for two months, while the German troops of Army Group Center, who had destroyed 95 percent of the Soviet forces facing them within three weeks and had advanced two-thirds of the way to Moscow, Despite the best weather from July to October 1941, the German army was now unable to move for three months⁷² It was solely due to this military sabotage by a handful of German military leaders in key positions, who were secretly working for Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill, that the German army came under increasing pressure and suffered its first setbacks in bad weather in November 1941 - and a victory that had been one hundred percent certain in July 1941 slipped away forever. The first major defeat for the Germans in World War II came on November 30, 1941, when the Soviets recaptured Rostov, and a few days before Pearl Harbor, the Germans were badly beaten and driven back by the Soviets off Moscow in the most important and decisive battle of the entire war. FDR rejoiced, for now it had become clear to every child that the bulk of the heavy fighting in the final phase of the war in Europe could be quietly left to Stalin.

After the German defeat before Moscow on December 5, 1941, it was clear that the rest of World War II in Europe would be child's play for the British and Americans - apart from a few annoying air raids on England, which were insignificant compared to the total devastation of the Reich by the Allied air forces. Just as in 1917, the US only needed to enter the war - via a detour via Japan on December 7, 1941 - to tip the scales in its favor, while others would do the bulk of the heavy lifting.

Kampies would take care of it. America gladly bore the brunt of the war against Japan, a small Asian country the size of California, with meager natural resources roughly the size of the US state of Mississippi. FDR's corrupt and plutocracy-sick United States did not need to fear a test that was not really a test at all⁷³.

It seems cynical for Galbraith to claim that "Hitler, having eliminated unemployment in Germany, set about ending it among his opponents. He was the true champion of Keynesian ideas".⁷⁴ For the sake of a witty formulation, Galbraith unwittingly blamed Hitler for the war provoked by Lord Halifax. More to the point, as Galbraith's academic colleague Burton Klein⁷⁵ pointed out, Schacht and his many supporters in the German business community weakened Germany's war effort during the crucial years 1938-1942 by successfully resisting adequate funding for German armaments. For example, England, with an industrial potential only half that of Germany, produced more tanks, fighter planes and medium bombers than Germany month after month in 1940, and also built up a huge fleet of heavy bombers - a costly modern war asset that Germany did not possess at all. The sabotage of Hitler's diplomacy by

the State Secretary Ernst von Weizsäcker and his staff in the German Foreign Ministry, the sabotage in the German espionage and secret service by Admiral Canaris and his defense, the sabotage of German army operations by the military treason elite together with Schacht's sabotage in the German war economy in 1936 - this was what made Germany lose a war that Hitler would have won in a walk if he had had a loyal leadership team⁷⁶.

Post-war America: false prosperity and the threat of bankruptcy

In the meantime - without any real challenge from outside - the catastrophe had also befallen the USA. Galbraith discovered soon after Pearl Harbor that "the ideas of Keynes, as Galbraith had developed them, could not be applied to inflation. Long before all the unemployed were back to work, corporations were able to raise prices - and they did. This in turn led to wage demands and subsequently to a wage-price spiral. At the same time, however, taxes could not be raised fast enough to keep pace with war spending. The surplus purchasing power could not be absorbed, as Keynes had intended".⁷⁷

The demands of the brief wartime emergency (1941-1945) were met with bureaucratic controls - a favorite tool during FDR's reign as dictator in chief: "Without the controls, prices would have doubled every year until the end of the war."⁷⁸ This is exactly what had happened under Abraham Lincoln's wartime dictatorship in the American North during the Civil War. As soon as the Second World War was over and the wartime controls were abandoned, a system that had worked well throughout the war began to burst at the seams: "In 1925, the pound had been made convertible at far too high an exchange rate - and the consequences were disastrous. Twenty-two years later, the same mistake was repeated with incredible precision."⁷⁹

The USA squandered 50 billion dollars in lend-lease aid to England during the Second World War (in comparison: for the militarily far more active Soviet Union there was only 11 billion), and after the end of the war further huge sums flowed incessantly to England - like money thrown down a well. Galbraith described the fate of one of the first post-war bonds to England, amounting to 3.75 billion dollars: how "the bond was squandered - literally in a few days".⁸⁰ In typical Vogel Strauss style, the USA temporarily concealed the basically hopeless conditions created by the ruinous and nihilistic Anglo-American financial policy, while in the USA alone a public debt of 2000000000000 dollars accumulated in one generation⁸¹.

The total gross national income of the USA in 1939 was only 90 billion dollars - less than 5 percent of the national debt a few decades later. Anyone who

has gained some insight into the "science of scarcity" ("economics") knows that a debt of this astronomical amount will never be paid - and certainly not by the luxury-loving and lazy America, which for many years has known nothing of the old-fashioned virtues of diligence and thrift. While the USA was hurtling down this deadly one-way street to permanent bankruptcy, it managed for many years to fool a lot of ignorant people all over the world with its supposedly successful policies, using the prestige of its supposedly magnificent victory in the Second World War and the legend of its supposed popularity with the former enemy nations of Japan, Italy and Germany, for example, and to spin the ridiculous fairy tale that chronic debt and permanent inflation together make a good and viable system. Galbraith described it with subtle irony: "So those were good years full of confidence - a good time for economists who claimed and took credit for what they had achieved. "82

Galbraith's gloomy forecast for the USA in 1977

Galbraith came to realize that "the Keynesian remedy worked asymmetrically: it worked against unemployment and depression, but not vice versa against inflation⁸³^ The level of unemployment required to curb American inflation after 1965 by laissez-faire means would have been tantamount to the genocide of half the US population. Galbraith knew that, short of a total fiscal collapse with its terrible consequences, there was only one alternative: the establishment of dictatorial wartime-style price and wage controls. This solution was the sine qua non of US economic survival after 1965. Although Galbraith publicly advocated this policy, he was realistic enough to suspect that, short of a major war, the problem would hardly be tackled with the necessary energy soon enough, indeed that the one remaining remedy would even be looked honestly in the face and accepted. The confessional aspect of Galbraith's 1977 position consisted mainly in his admission that, in a state of affairs such as the economists agreed, the total collapse of the US public finances had become inevitable, whether or not there were any belated efforts to avert it⁸⁴ . The impending collapse itself would create a new situation, a tabula rasa, which the educated American nationalists are reluctant to face because they know that the modern pluralistic United States is held together by a single cement, the dollar, and that the fragile, heterogeneous social structure that holds the oppressed American masses in check will collapse without this dollar mortar: You would no longer be able to pay the police their exorbitant salaries- but without it, heads would roll, blood would literally flow in the streets. As Galbraith clearly summarized it: "It is an omen of radical change that not many like to face. "85

Whether they like it or not, history always takes its toll. More than thirty

years after World War II, with its myriad American war crimes—from mass shootings to mass conventional and nuclear bombings—and the myriad American postwar crimes—from the starvation of millions of innocent people to the execution of thousands of helpless prisoners or the surrender of five million of them to Stalin—Galbraith has revealed that the attitude of American plutocratic evildoers has not changed: Their indifference to human suffering at home has remained the same, and so too—despite military defeats in Korea and Vietnam—has their enthusiasm for mass death and mass destruction abroad, as recently in the Middle East and South Africa, whether brought about by the vast American arms export trade or, more preferably, by direct U.S. military aggression. No real change from the ground up has occurred, the blindness has not been remedied, because the Second World War and the American wars that followed, like the war of 1898 with Spain and the First World War, hardly affected 98 percent of the American people in any significant way. Like Switzerland, the USA has yet to learn the reality of warfare in the 20th century from the ground up.

After Pearl Harbor, the predominantly Jewish War Information Office of the USA succeeded in brainwashing the entire American population into changing their opinion of the years 1929-1941 that the First World War was morally a mistake and financially without profit. As a result, most US citizens believed—and still believe with genuine enthusiasm—that World War II was both successful and profitable for the US. This strikingly demonstrates the power of mass seduction as practiced by the Jewish monopolized US public media. If they were silent for just one month, America would wake up like Rip van Winkle⁸⁶ to realize the tragedy and futility of the past decades. The Jewish American media has aided and abetted the massive US arms trade abroad, the conspiracies and assassinations around the world at the instigation of FDR and his successors, and the euphoric US foreign policy of constant challenge and aggression, especially against the weaker states, based on the untenable legend of US global superiority. America's citizens have begun to suspect that in an all too long period of peace, economic catastrophe could be lurking just around the corner, but they also continue to cherish the belief that if war does come, then the USA can make its blood money from the misery of others, in a way that was already visibly successful in 1861, 1898, 1917 and 1941.

It is quite clear why the once mighty John Kenneth Galbraith resigned and became a fatalist. His confession, in a nutshell, is that of the imminent demise of the USA and all those nations that have become closely linked to the imperialist fate of the USA.

Second chapter

THE FLIP SIDE OF THE AMERICAN STORY

The historical parallel

One of the main theses of Oswald Spengler's work *The Decline of the West*, which describes the decline of certain cultures and civilizations amidst the many spirals of world history, is this: The process of decline accelerates when a separation occurs between the place of origin of a culture and the prevailing political and military center of power. Thus the decline of the Greek world was precipitated after 146 BC - the year in which the Romans destroyed both the western base of the Semites, Carthage, and the old Indo-European-Greek base, Corinth - because the last major attempt by Aratus of Sicyon¹ to reunite the classical Greeks against the Roman barbaroi had failed, and the rise in power of the Romans caused Greek influence in military and political matters, and then in art, to wane. The Romans forever lacked the necessary creativity to replace it.

Spengler described the heartland of modern Western civilization very precisely: the Italian peninsula plus the region beyond the Alps from the Ebro River in Spain to the Elbe in Germany. Of the waves of creative power that radiated from this core area, it can be said that they were strong and pronounced in the valleys of the Oder and Vistula rivers beyond the Elbe, and also in those of the Tagus and Guadalquivir beyond the Ebro, but only weakly in the modern European colonial region of America, where - as Constance Rourke noted in her perceptive books that began to appear half a century ago² - there has never been an independent American culture since the oppression of the native Indians. Once upon a time, Greek decline caused culture in Rome to wane; today, culture in America is withering from European decline. Egon Frieden (1878-1938) recalled³ that for the Greeks the peacock was an ugly and hideous bird, while the Romans called it the epitome of beauty. Ergo: Roman aesthetics degenerated without the guidance of the Greeks.

Without the successful and mainly anti-European divide et impera tactics of modern Anglo-Norman imperialism during the period of British naval rule

between Trafalgar (1805) and Singapore (1942), the suppression of human rights and self-determination in the Confederate States of America (1865) would not necessarily have been the beginning of the end of modern Europe⁴. Similarly, the destruction of the foreign Semitic power of Carthage by the Romans would not necessarily have been the beginning of the end for the Greeks if only the *Ö!J.OvOLa* had still prevailed (the Greek unity achieved by Alexander the Great in the 4th century BC). It was the combination of Roman naval supremacy in the western and central Mediterranean and Greek disunity that destroyed Greece, just as the combination of successful Yankee imperialism in the western hemisphere and European disunity - fueled and constantly fed by Anglo-Norman imperialism - partially destroyed Europe in 1918 and then totally destroyed it in 1945 as far as military power and politics were concerned.

Modern Rome lies on the Potomac

Washington/D. C. in 1865 was an oversized village with mud holes and free-roaming pigs⁵. Rome, on the other hand, was still a shantytown of flimsy wooden buildings when Julius Caesar, in 49 BC, dismantled his camp on the Adriatic and crossed the Rubicon River to destroy the Roman Republic and replace it with his own lawless and arbitrary dictatorship, which became the starting point of the despotic empire and a long period of Roman tyranny over the entire Mediterranean world⁶. The seeds of Rome's own downfall were already sown in Rome's total triumph over Greece - however much individual Romans valued Greek culture - just as the seeds of the destruction of the USA and USSR were contained in their total triumph over Europe, despite the fact that some Americans and Russians valued European culture. Romans, Americans and Russians lacked the innate creativity to keep a great civilization going, and their own greatness inevitably dwindled as the Greeks and modern Europeans, deprived of their fair share of military and political power, slowly withered away instead of remaining the glorious pioneers of civilization. Their role had been callously usurped by the brutal, complacent and, unintentionally, self-destructive barbaroi.

Countless books - especially by European observers - have documented the crude and often callous barbarism of the culturally weak American branch of European civilization. Most revealing, however, is a comprehensive account of economic history, for most Americans are crass materialists par excellence^L. They lack the historical worldview that is natural among educated Italians, French or Germans, and they are slavishly obsessed with the power of numbers,

mere statistics, rather than indulging in ideas and the realm of abstract thought. Primitive principles have dominated the American scene from its earliest beginnings - such as Benjamin Franklin's that time is money, or that of the pragmatist trio of leading American philosophers, C. S. Peirce, William James and John Dewey: the classical philosophical ideals of the good, the beautiful and the true are merely what prevail at any given time. In each century, the prevailing American attitude increased in crudeness - at the same rate as the temporal distance from its European roots increased - and this despite the incessant immigration from Europe, albeit of predominantly underclass and uneducated elements of the populations there.

In this largely cultureless, indeed often arrogantly and deliberately culturally hostile pluralistic American environment, where, with increasingly mixed immigration, the "racial melting pot" became wishful thinking, but mere whitewashing became reality, the almighty dollar-with the adjunct of a brutal police force-became the only unifying cement in a kind of cooperation for bare survival for a selfish mass of bastardized individuals in which any ethnic distinctiveness, as in Italy, France or Germany, is simply unimaginable.

When J. K. Galbraith, the top economist of the American establishment in the 20th century, told the world in the late 1970s that the dollar - the only social bond of the USA - was about to dissolve forever⁹, the prediction of what form the social dissolution of the USA would take became more than idle, sophisticated speculation. The American economic historian-whether an academic exemplar like H. U. Faulkner¹⁰ or a roughneck like Gustavus Myers¹¹-is a good guide to the process that made the 20th century American what it is. Although Faulkner was the first American economic historian to enjoy unrestricted access to the vast economic data available in the records of the U.S. Bureau of Statistics since 1790, Myers' research method was no less inventive and exhaustive; and while the final conclusions of the two historians are very similar, the more direct and uninhibited Myers better grasped the old Euclidean theorem that the straight line is the shortest line between two points. That is why Myers, like Dante's Beatrice¹², is the better guide of the two.

The USA: a plutocratic oligarchy

Myers'¹³ main investigation into the traditionally unlawful accumulation of the commonly worshipped wealth in an American society ruled solely by selfishness and materialistic greed only takes on its full meaning when one considers how the group of individual malefactors he describes could succeed and escape punishment, given that these villains - with their disregard for all human rights - were individuals of low ability and virtually uneducated.

American society was from the beginning-and still is-a plutocratic oligarchy with an antiquated 16th century English Star Chamber-type legal system based on socioeconomic regression: the less you own, the more exploitation you endure; the more inept you are at bribery-the traditional oil in the American justice machinery-the more you become acquainted with the abuses of brutal American police power. In short, for the top-heavy American plutocratic society as it was emerging, there had to be a pattern of development going back to colonial times, and it was cleverly designed to help the rich get richer and force the poor into even greater poverty. It has been a thesis of Dr. Philip Sorensen, Education Manager of the Stanford Research Institute, for years that poverty cannot be eradicated in the US because of the inherent depravity of the political and socio-economic system^M.

In the socioeconomic history of the United States, there is the institutionalization of poverty, while the robber barons and heavy-rich evildoers are zealously and carefully protected. While the lack of a formal caste system, as well as the existence of widespread "frontier" conditions, gave the impression until the recent past that the American social process was in flux - and fools took this as evidence of unlimited opportunity for everyone - in reality the American system was and is designed to keep the average person in his place; free only in the sense that he can stand around and stare at the excesses of plutocrats who inherently despise any meaningful role for the law. A few rich men fall because of their incredible abuses, and a few poor men rise because of their incredible crimes. Johann Wolfgang Goethe's *Amerika*, du hast es besser was never intended by its author as a glorification of the USA, but as an attack on the pretentious, status-conscious and reactionary German aristocracy of the 19th century hundred years.

The system originated in England

In the politically reactionary early days of the independent United States, there was never any serious doubt that the antiquated 16th century English common law system would be retained in America¹⁵, although a few 18th century American patriots such as Patrick Henry and Sam Adams - soon labeled radicals by others who rallied behind the wealthy George Washington - spoke and fought in vain for its abolition. Queen Elizabeth 1st, a cold-blooded and ugly tyrant like her father Henry VIII and her grandfather Henry VII, introduced a permanent system of concentration camps in England for the rebellious and destitute poor, the so-called English Workhouse System, which lasted in England until the 20th century. This cruel but practical system

absorbed the substantial portion of the English population made expendable by the Tudors' ruthless and greedy Enclosure Policy. "Enclosure" simply meant the arbitrary mass confiscation of the farms of English freemen - and this policy also continued, with occasional interruptions such as during the English Civil War of the 17th century, well into the 19th century¹⁶.

The Tudor measures of exploitation and oppression, which included the most violent criminal law known to the world (with 76 offenses punishable by death), were generously backed up by the Star-Chamber judiciary and English common law¹⁷. The German left-wing Marxist sociologist Max Weber¹⁸ had the idea that all this English violence had a religious root, one mysteriously linked to the intrusion of Calvinist elements after Henry VIII's separation from the Catholic Church - but this view was conclusively refuted by Amintore Fanfani¹⁹. Violent measures of property expropriation and conscription of innocents had been typical of England since the Hanseatic-sponsored Norman conquest of England in 1066, and the only difference came later in the 16th century when the English establishment overcame its sense of economic inferiority to the two much richer countries of Germany and Italy and no longer allowed foreigners - especially the Hanseatic League - to dominate England's trade, manufactures and capital investment²⁰.

Locke and Montesquieu, the intellectual fathers

Merle Curti of the University of Wisconsin, the most learned of the many American historians²¹ of American political thought, claimed unchallenged time and again in his books, essays, papers and lectures that none other than the English empiricist John Locke (1632-1704) was America's chief political philosopher. In fact, 90 percent of the so-called body of ideas of the prevailing American political philosophy up to the present day can be found in Locke. However, the only two works by Locke that ever influenced America were published in London in the same year, 1690²². These works had the sole purpose of whitewashing the cynical and brazen coup d'état of the English Whigs, which they had undertaken with foreign armed assistance through William of Nazareth-Orange against the legitimate dynasty of the Stuarts in England, Wales, Cornwall, Scotland and Ireland. The Whigs-Wilhelm alliance won the third English civil war (1688-1690) of the 17th century²³. The success of the coup was a disaster for Ireland, where blood once again flowed in the streets during the Oranian Reign of Terror, as well as for Scotland, which had by no means forfeited its ancient independence simply because its King James had ascended the English throne in 1603 in personal union. Formal annexation, attempted in London in 1707, met with resistance in Scotland, and it was not until 38 years later, at the Battle of Culloden in 1746, that the Scots' last attempt

at liberation was drowned in blood by the artillery of the Duke of Cumberland, as well as by Cumberland's subsequent extermination measures against broad sections of the Scottish population²⁴.

Locke's attitude in 1690 was unique in one important respect. King Charles I Stuart had been publicly assassinated in 1649 by Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) and his bloodthirsty Roundheads²⁵, but the republican Commonwealth dictatorship established by Cromwell collapsed quickly and ingloriously in 1660 thanks to the incompetence of Cromwell's son Richard, whom the senile dictator had mistakenly appointed as his successor shortly before his death. Charles II and James II, the sons of the royal martyr, now ruled in succession for thirty years (1660-1690). At this time (until 1688, when it looked as if the Stuart cause would not be able to survive in England in the long term), John Locke was the strongest and most outspoken advocate of the Stuart restoration among English "social contract" philosophers and was also known throughout Europe as a political "God's grace" absolutist. During these years he professed Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), the most profound English political philosopher of all time, as his spiritual guide²⁶. Hobbes, a true intellectual giant, was dead and no longer to be feared when Locke's books appeared in 1690. Had Hobbes still been alive, he could have refuted both of Locke's books in one day. Now the dead Hobbes became the defenseless prime target of Locke's attack on behalf of the plutocratic, anti-Stuart Whigs and their so-called Glorious Revolution²⁷ of 1688. By trampling on the to' en lion in 1690, Locke was in effect trampling on himself and everything he had stood for in the first 58 years of his life²⁸.

The English system after 1690, which Locke defended in his senile late years, was essentially the same one that is still at the helm in England today—with a few concessions: the political emancipation of Catholics in 1832, the abolition of slavery after 1834, and the gradual realization (since 1848) of the old Cromwellian program for the political emancipation of Jews in England (in the wake of the collapse of the Chartist movement²⁹).

The main attraction for the upstart Colonial Americans was Locke's unlimited moral relativism (the pro- or anti-Christian stance was made a question of expediency), his unlimited ability to rationalize³⁰ and, above all, his perverse and pragmatic abuse of the "social contract" concept introduced by Hobbes³¹ and developed in Germany by Samuel Pufendorf (1632-1694), and, above all, his perverse and pragmatic abuse of the "social contract" concept introduced by Hobbes³¹ and refined in Germany by Samuel Pufendorf (1632-1694) to justify violent political overthrow on the flimsiest of pretexts.

Locke, of course, was not a competent English constitutional authority like Blackstone, and most of the specific features of today's US federal constitution are not borrowed from Locke, but from Baron Charles de Montesquieu (1689-1735)³². It is a fact, however, that Montesquieu himself was a student of

Locke, and that-although his style favored Aristotelian terminology-he drew his eclecticism and moral relativism directly from Locke, who also strongly influenced other well-known, if superficial, French philosophers of the Enlightenment, such as Jean d'Alembert (1717-1783) and Denis Diderot (1713-1784). By contrast, the two truly profound philosophers of the Enlightenment, Voltaire (1694-1778) and Rousseau (1712-1778), rejected Locke as a shallow fool.

Two common traits of Locke's and Montesquieu's pragmatic and empirical thinking in particular appealed to the creators of the American Declaration of Independence of 1776 and the Second Federal Constitution of 1787 - the latter of which is still in force today: Locke and Montesquieu both hated democracy, and both took refuge in the legacy of Aristotle by incorporating monarchical (in reality despotic) and aristocratic (in reality oligarchical) traits into their political worldview. The crude and highly treasonous seizure of power by the modern cabinet government in England, which Locke defended one hundred percent in his books of 1690, although it was treason on the part of the Whigs was to call in foreign troops against the lawful English government - so this seizure of power appealed to the politically reactionary American also-rans of the following century^{33^}

The "founding fathers" did not want parties

A fascinating detail of the whole process is the self-delusion of the 55 delegates to the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention³⁴ of 1787 that no system of political parties could function under their new anti-democratic and authoritarian system as a result of the enormous power of the presidency (which was rejected by the majority of delegates from the outset as "TOO partisan"). In England after 1690, with its unitary cabinet system and denial of local political autonomy, an entrenched political party system first appeared under the Whig leader Robert Walpole, Earl of Oxford (167&-1745). The English two-party system of Whigs and Tories, as it emerged under Prime Minister Walpole, was based on an electorate for the House of Commons of not yet 3 percent of English male adults and a House of Lords with hereditary membership, a legislative power equal to that of the House of Commons and supreme judicial power as the highest court in the land. The House of Lords received fresh blood - albeit rarely in those days - through the Cabinet's discretionary assignment of high aristocratic titles^{35^} Because Locke, who was made the philosopher of America three generations after his death, did not envisage a regular party system in his books of 1690, instead expecting that the Whigs would take office as Lords, the Whigs would retain the office of Lord Chancellor in perpetuity,

those men in America who, as self-appointed delegates to the illegal convention of 1787, had imposed the present authoritarian constitution on the USA³⁶ were genuinely surprised when an American party system, albeit a weak one for the time being, was formed after the introduction of the new system (1789).

The modern English plutocratic oligarchy came to power in 1690, the modern American plutocratic oligarchy 99 years later - in 1789. The essentially arbitrary nature of the English system is still embodied in its Permanent Foreign Office and its cabinet privilege to declare wars without having to ask the House of Commons. These despotic rights still exist despite the post-World War II Marxist-fabian-socialist welfare state superimposed upon them. This corrupt plutocratic oligarchy proved irresistibly attractive to the seventh generation of American colonists who had declared their independence from England. It served as a model for them - despite their eight-year war (1775-1783) against the English mercantilist system. Although England was a unitary state and the USA was federalist, and although the USA followed Montesquieu's system of 1748 with its separation of the executive, legislative and judicial branches instead of combining them all into a single power as in the English cabinet system, the differences are more apparent than real. The US federalist system withered away almost completely during the first half of the 20th century without producing any significant new policy approaches, and the enormous growth of American legislation by decree, together with the disgraceful capitulation of the Supreme Court to the presidency in 1937, made a mockery of Montesquieu's concept³⁷ of separation of powers as far as the US was concerned. Like a disgruntled domestic henpecked husband who thinks that occasionally smashing dishes and furniture might cover up the fact that he is the prisoner of a familial matriarchy, the U.S. Congress-completely corrupt since its inception in 1789-is wont to behave unruly from time to time, but is usually totally subservient to the president thanks to the activities of government intelligence agencies and the perfected art of executive blackmail of the legislative branch - a condition that President Lyndon B. Johnson openly bragged about in the sixties.

If federalism had ever been a truly important part of the American system after 1789, then a self-appointed dictator like the South-hating Southerner Abraham Lincoln could not have waged the largest war in history (1861-1865) against US federalism and destroyed the thirteen sovereign states of the American South. In 1848, the outstanding political leader from South Carolina, John Calhoun³⁸, had the Prussian envoy in the USA inform the Prussian King Frederick William IV that the German National Assembly in the Paulskirche in Frankfurt should not allow itself to be influenced by the American Constitution of 1787 in its search for a Greater German federalist constitution, and certainly should not regard it as a model, as this constitution had completely failed as a

workable system of political federalism. Calhoun made his view clear to the Prussians by explaining in detail why the constitutional allocation of power to the executive was excessive and how, as a result, the rights of the supposedly sovereign states had become a mockery and the power allocated to the legislature and judiciary a joke. For example, when the most powerful Chief Justice of all time, John Marshall of Virginia, announced a unanimous constitutional decision of the Supreme Court that President Andrew Jackson (1829-1837) did not like, this crude autocrat from Tennessee responded with raw sarcasm: "Well, if Marshall has so decided, let him go and enforce it - knowing full well, of course, that the Court was solely dependent on the help of the President himself to enforce its decision. Jackson himself was a lawyer, but in those days on the American "frontier" you only needed six weeks to become a lawyer, whether you had any training or not - and Jackson had none.

The economic credo also came from the Old World:
Quesnay and the School of Physiocrats

Locke and Montesquieu gave the mixed European-American colonial people their political system, but the colonists who wanted to establish their own plutocratic oligarchy on a permanent basis had to import economic philosophers from Europe as well. Lest there be any mistake on this point, it must be clearly understood that the seventh generation of American colonists, including Washington, Franklin, and Jefferson, were necessarily incapable of inventing their own political and socioeconomic system. Cultural educational opportunities were extremely limited in 18th century America³⁹ and no American possessed the intellectual capacity to make independent achievements. Although for generations after Horace Mann introduced a paranoid, dirigiste public school system in the USA after 1830, young Americans were exposed to the messianic nonsense that their legendary "founding fathers" possessed a supernatural wisdom that surpassed anything the world had known before, there was - needless to say - no truth in the crude, exaggerated propaganda of the American school system⁴⁰.

The American Declaration of Independence-philosophically based on the neo-Epicurean hedonistic concept of the individual's selfish pursuit of happiness-openly centered on the most brutal kind of egocentrism and was a total and deliberate political counterfeit in that it exclusively attacked the incompetent, insane English King George III and unscrupulously left Lord North's all-powerful Tory cabinet and the House of Commons with its Tory

majority completely unscathed - namely for the sake of future advantage. That a shabby achievement like this Declaration of 1776 or an even worse piece of propagandistic deception, the Gettysburg Address of the dictator Abraham Lincoln⁴¹ of November 1863, which swept the real problems of the Civil War under the carpet with crocodile tears, are still regarded as the high points of American political thought, speaks for itself: there has never been any political thinking at all in the USA, only intrigue and indiscriminate plagiarism in the true sense of the word.

Americans were and are incapable of thinking through their system forcefully - a system of maximum exploitation of their oppressed masses at home and maximum chauvinistic political and economic imperialism abroad. One need only recall the prolific so-called triangular trade that flourished for 200 years from about 1630 to 1830: rum from New England - especially Rhode Island - went to Africa, African black slaves went to the West Indies, West Indian sugar went to New England to make new rum - and so on, for eight generations seemingly ad infinitum. Or there was the China-Clip- per trade⁴² that began in 1784, the year after the US made peace with England at the end of the War of Independence. To promote that trade during the following six generations, the U.S. demanded and received "me too" privileges with every new shameless British crime and aggression against China's venerable and civilized Ching Dynasty⁴³. The most prestigious old Boston families are still known today as the "rum and nigger" fortunes, and President Frank Roosevelt told his cabinet in 1933 that he had a special interest in the Far East because he was proud of the successful participation of both his paternal and maternal ancestors in the Anglo-American opium trade (which had been forced on China by bayonets in brutal defiance of the legal prohibition of drugs in the empire of the tangerine). These are the fresh and dirty facts of U.S. history - as opposed to the prissy wishful thinking taught in American schools.

The key to the perpetual justification of the American dream of economic oligarchy over everything - at home and abroad - can be found in Francois Quesnay (1694-1774) and his so-called School of Physiocrats⁴⁴. France had undertaken a twofold experiment after the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1714)⁴⁵ . Firstly, a league of the major European powers - France, England, Austria and Prussia⁴⁶ - was to maintain world order and prevent major wars. This French League of 1715 later served Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) as a model for his concept of a "League for Perpetual Peace". The League of 1715 lacked the deceptive and hypocritical pretensions of the League of Nations in Geneva in 1920 and the United Nations (UN) in 1945. It took the English leaders five years to undermine and destroy the League of 1715 from within, just as it took them five years a century later to destroy the "concert" of

European powers that Prince Metternich had created in Vienna in 1815. The global supremacy of the Geneva League of 1920 was based solely on the Anglo-French alliance and the French security system⁴⁷. The British leaders, led by Baldwin and Eden, managed to destroy the Geneva League of Nations system from within in 1936. Finally, the UN system was already stillborn in terms of practical functioning at the San Francisco Assembly of 1945, because the cooperation between the USA and the USSR, on which the new world system was to be based, had already collapsed.

Secondly, France experimented with the new mercantilist system for the domestic economy. This was popular and paternalistic, devised to rein in the plutocratic evildoers, and was similar to the state socialist dream of Jean Colbert (1619-1683) in the previous century. Colbert's system had perished financially in a series of pointless wars with which France was overrun by England. The new French system after 1715 collapsed in the panic of 1720 in connection with the South Sea scam, in which the Scottish financial adviser to the Bourbon court, John Law, was made a convenient scapegoat in France, while the real cause was something else: the fact that England had usurped the former French role of economic broker in the Spanish and Portuguese colonial system.

Now came Quesnay, a general practitioner in France at the time of the South Sea scam. He drew the false conclusion that the collapse of French domestic mercantilism - under Colbert in the 17th century and now under John Law in the 18th century - had proved that France was not fit for mercantilism (a view that has more recently been disproved by the successful economic policies of the Petain regime in France after 1940). Quesnay, who had switched from medicine to economics, redefined the basic values in such a way that - in the spirit of the opportunistic French King Henry IV (1553-1610)⁴⁹ - it was most appropriate for the French genius to approach socio-economic issues in a cynical and selfishly individualistic manner. Translated into economic terminology, this meant that Quesnay demanded *laissez-faire* instead of paternalism from the French absolute monarchy, which had already got rid of the traditional legislative Estates-General in 1614. In other words, he demanded an economic jungle anarchy in which everyone ate everyone else and the last one was left to bite the dogs. And indeed, the French state complied with these demands - with disastrous consequences - under both Louis XV and Louis XVI.⁵⁰

Unlike France, there was never any real alternative for the USA, because the wild socio-economic anarchy that characterized the American scene from Jamestown in 1609 to the present day would never - at least not before the 20th century - have tolerated any clean rules of economic law and order that would have allowed the state to act as a kind of impartial arbiter in the economic

conflicts of its citizens and that would have ensured at least a minimum of protection for the weak and helpless. The selfish economic anarchy could not be avoided - the problem was simply to find the foreign economic philosopher and his philosophical school who was best suited to conceal the whole nasty mess with a dignified theater. Quesnay and his physiocrats⁵¹ met these requirements perfectly.

The growth gospel of Adam Smith

Among the foreign Quesnay physicists was the ambitious Scottish economist Adam Smith (1723-1790). Smith was a professor in Glasgow, and his major work⁵² appeared in 1776 at the right time to ensure its greatest impact. He was later credited with a certain latent influence on the unsuccessful English laissez-faire experiment of 1849-1931⁵³. Smith faced a situation in Scotland in the seventies of the 18th century that was even worse than that in the USA, where between 1775 and 1783 the population was divided roughly 50:50 and split between pro-Tory mercantilism and pro-Whig mercantilism⁵⁴. Apart from military aid from France, Holland and Spain, American success in the War of Independence was made possible by the fact that the English Whigs were quite naturally in favor of the Americans liberating themselves from the Tories and winning their revolution. It was as much about prestige as it was about the office of Lord Chancellor. The decisive English defeat at Yorktown⁵⁵ in 1781 ruined the Tories politically for the entire eighties. They only regained their position in 1793, when they managed to shed enough crocodile tears over the fate of their old enemy Louis XVI to unleash a new English war against France, even though no French acts of aggression against England had taken place. The 18th century USA was of little economic value to London compared to the sugar islands, Jamaica and other West Indian islands. The English Whigs of the seventies reasoned that an independent America was a small price to pay for the overthrow of the Tories. Had the best military commander of the entire war, General Howe, not been a Whig, there might not have been a U.S. victory over his weaker counterpart, Tory General Burgoyne, at Saratoga (1777)-the event that brought France into the war and saved the rebels. Burgoyne's forces had invaded the United States from Canada in the north. Howe, however, instead of now marching up the Hudson River from his base in New York City to support Burgoyne-as the English colonial minister Sir Germain had ordered-sailed south with his brilliant army across the Chesapeake Bay to Philadelphia, a larger and even more pleasant city than New York⁶⁰. When Lord North received the news about Yorktown in 1781, he threw up his hands, exclaimed, the

situation was hopeless, and resigned. Lord Cornwallis, who had lost the Battle of Yorktown to the Americans and French, was made Viceroy of India - a very

lucrative reward. The peace negotiations between England and the USA lasted another year and a half, but the USA was then safe - and it was not difficult for the Whigs to defeat the USA's former wartime allies France, Holland and Spain.

Scotland was a different case. Adam Smith's opus on the supposed glories of laissez-faire and free trade was published barely 30 years after the Battle of Culloden and Cumberland's campaign of extermination against large sections of the Scottish population. Most Scots at this time (1776) hated the English so much that even an Irishman, Welshman or Cornishman would have found it hard to imagine. Smith's influence in Scotland was due to the fact that England had taken all of French Canada and almost all of the Indian possessions from Louis XV in the Peace of Paris in 1763. Although battles against the Hindus, Sikhs and Nepalese were still to come, the end result - with French, Portuguese and Dutch rivals in India now squeezed or eliminated - was predictable.

Smith was shrewd enough to realize that the acquisition of the immensely rich and vast Indian subcontinent made England at a stroke the greatest imperialist power of all time. Since France, which was still the dominant power in India at the outbreak of the Seven Years' War in 1756, had never had the time to consolidate its position in India, all the earlier Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch and French colonial empires were but modest compared with the present British Empire after 1763. The theme of the most important English novel⁶¹ of all time, "The Mayor of Casterbridge"⁶² by Thomas Hardy (1840-1928), is, as is well known, the admission by the author (the outstanding literary genius of England) that in matters of money, a Scotsman always outwits an Englishman. Smith now successfully persuaded his fellow Scots (or at least the powerful and influential Glasgow merchants) that political enslavement by the English, even if it had ended proud Scottish nationalism after 800 years of successful resistance⁶³, could nevertheless mean an economic advantage for some Scots - and on this point Smith was certainly a prophet: a hundred years later, at the time of Hardy's greatest novel, the phrase was known throughout the world: India is a

Land conquered by the Irish in the service of the English, and ruled by the English for the benefit of the Scots. All this ended during the 20th century thanks to English political and military aggression against Germany, especially in 1914 and 1939, but it had meant big money for seven generations of Glasgow merchants.

Incidentally, Smith's economic theories were no less flawed than those of his materialist soulmate three generations later, Karl Marx (1818-1883): Smith claimed-absurdly, as it turned out-that free trade was a permanent advantage to every nation, just as Marx later-and no less absurdly-claimed that the middle class of every society, by its ruthlessness, drove so many talented people from its own ranks down into the proletariat that the latter would thereby become a

formidable political force. This has never happened and will hardly ever happen, because proletarians *ab definitio* (they live only for the moment) are incapable of any sensible politics.

Robert Burns (1759-1796), greatest of all Scottish poets and a good Scottish nationalist to boot, had to admit to his own regret that Dundee and the other Scottish politicians of the late 18th century successfully sold Adam Smith's crude and materialistic ideas of growth to a considerable section of the Scottish middle classes, thereby - as it turned out - postponing the restoration of Scotland's freedom and independence from English imperialism and political tyranny for at least a century. Adam Smith's influence on the USA was no less catastrophic. In our own day, foreign-born Jewish economists like Friedrich von Hayek and Ludwig von Mises have convinced an alarmingly large proportion of the American-Dumb- Right ("America's dumb right"=rich Americans who dislike the collapse of US nationalism, which they are unwittingly hastening) that Adam Smith still trumps all, while serious people in his native Scotland have long since abandoned him.

Utilitarianism becomes the philosophy
of intellectually underdeveloped America

Apart from political and socio-economic theory, the philosophical-intellectual vacuum still remained in America, since - as Nietzsche observed very accurately a hundred years ago - the so-called American philosophers of the caliber of Ralph Waldo Emerson or David Thoreau were nothing more than mere babblers and fools. Unfortunately, the philosophical vacuum of the USA was filled by the crude English utilitarians: with Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), James Mill (1773-1836), John Stuart Mill (1806--1873), Beatrice Webb (1858-1943), and Sidney Webb (1859-1947)⁶⁵ Bentham, the authoritative innovator in the long and barren line of English utilitarians, was a rabidly anti-Christian radical humanist, claiming that a successful Tower of Babel was still possible, original sin could be undone and paradise on earth brought about if only the rest of the world outside England adopted Bentham's theory that the constant perfection of mankind (as envisaged by Condorcet) could be achieved according to the formula of "the greatest possible happiness for the greatest possible number of Englishmen". It must be remembered that in Bentham's day the English population explosion was the greatest in the history of mankind⁶⁶. Like most statisticians throughout the ages, Bentham had a bad habit of confusing short-term trends with long-term ones, and accordingly assumed that within a few centuries there would be a worldwide English majority (a doctrine later adopted by American Anglo-Saxonism⁶⁷), and all those inferior races - which Rudyard Kipling (1865-1936) later contemptuously dismissed as the inferior breed - would dwindle before a mighty, worldwide English master race.

Once the English population explosion of the late 19th century had dried up, it should have become clear (but unfortunately did not) that Bentham's euphoric ideas were pure arrogant madness. There was, however, a certain realization: The Surrender of an ^{Empire}⁶⁸ by Nesta Webster was published barely a century after Bentham's death. Winston Churchill, who never grasped Nesta Webster's great ideas, was nevertheless influenced by her prophetic book and based his objection to the personal agreement between Halifax and Gandhi in 1931 on it. Chorchili

did not realize that the Indian Viceroy Lord Halifax in 1931 was in reality as hostile to Gandhi as the Foreign Secretary Lord Halifax was to Hitler in 1939. Halifax successfully deceived Gandhi and ruined the last years of his life, but this tragic fact must have escaped Churchill's limited, sluggish perception⁶⁹.

Nesta Webster warned that the last hour had come for the English Empire, and Churchill lived to see it-especially after the fall of Lord Avon, his beloved Anthony Eden, in 1956-to see the Empire reduced to a miserable heap of cold ashes as a direct consequence of his own policies and those of Lord Halifax. You transit gloria Albionis. Bentham's influence was the single greatest intellectual factor that hastened the English collapse, and also explains why the US, despite its strong position after 1865 and its once abundant natural resources, has little chance of reaching the end of the 20th century as a viable entity.

Lest there be any doubt as to how total and pervasive Bentham's philosophical influence was on the USA during the 19th and 20th centuries, John Stuart Mill's work⁷⁰ from 1843 contains all the relevant philosophy, which can be found in the same way in the philosophical treatises of Charles Peirce (published after 1878), as well as in those of William James (published from 1898) and John Dewey (published after 1916). Dewey continued to write - albeit without much real insight - until his death in 1952. Harry Elmer Barnes (1889-1968), a prolific American historian and sociologist and personal friend of Dewey's, has been called "the perfect Benthamite" with good reason⁷¹. Barnes, not without talent as an academic organizer and administrator, was intellectually a copyist, devoid of the capacity for independent achievement. Many of his published writings came from his principal ghostwriter, the brilliant left-wing intellectual Jew Tony Netboy. Barnes borrowed his sociological ideas from August Comte and Lester Ward and his thoughts on the history of modern diplomacy from Sidney Fay, Richard Current and David Hoggan - all three of whom collaborated with Barnes at one time or another on a purely scholarly and historical basis. None of the 55 books attributed to Barnes contain truly new ideas. Above all, Barnes was a reincarnation of Bentham in philosophical terms. The book The Twilight of Christianity ⁷² could easily have been written by Bentham himself, except for a few non-essential

modern scientific details. Most unfortunate was the fact that Barnes, like all utilitarians, proclaimed to advocate gentleness and light and the welfare of mankind, but remained an exceedingly arrogant, autocratic and vindictive man in all his dealings. In his writings, he did spread some healthy historical revisionist ideas, and he probably also proved helpful to other revisionist authors, but on the other hand, with his incredibly cruel and sadistic persecution of outstanding revisionists, such as Richard Current, William Neuman, William Hasseltine, Hermann Lutz, F.J.P. Veale and many, many others, he did far more harm than good for revisionism after 1918 and after 1945, both in the USA and in Europe.

What is most characteristic of the actual thrust of English and American utilitarianism is that John Stuart Mill moved politically from bourgeois-physiocratic/*laissez-faire*⁷³ to collectivist left-wing socialism⁷⁴. The advantage in the sophistry of Mill's concept of the Good Citizen - the Good Citizen should be able to do what he wanted as long as he did not harm anyone else - was its unlimited moral relativism. As long as Mill was a disciple of the Jewish economist David Ricardo (1772-1823) in the socio-economic field - who glorified the superiority of the usurious House of Rothschild in England as an example of entrepreneurial genius⁷⁵ - the English plutocratic evildoers had nothing to fear from Mill's concept of the Good Citizen⁷⁶. Things were quite different in the following decade, when Mill gradually succumbed to the insidious propaganda in Friedrich Engels' "The Condition of the Working Classes in England"⁷⁷ - the best and most academically impressive publication of the entire Marxist school. Now, suddenly, the English plutocratic miscreants saw themselves endangered by Mill's Good Citizens - Mill now condemned their plundering of the English masses, which he had previously tolerated. Mill's arbiter in the process of deciding what the Good Citizen should not be allowed to do was, of course, the state, but Mill, in his unbridled presumption, always acted as if he himself were that arbiter, even the state. From his own leap from Quesnay to Marx, he believed after 1860 that everyone else should be forced to do the same. He did not realize that there were many good alternatives to Quesnay, but that Marx was a bad one.

This dirigiste concept, abused by Mill, prompted Georg W. F. Hegel (1770-1831) - who had a more idealistic idea of freedom in Germany beyond the North Sea than could ever be dreamed of in the ponderous, utilitarian-pragmatic gloom of England and America - Hegel thus felt compelled to recommend that the Prussian citizen keep pace with the enlightened Prussian state as the best means of protecting and developing the sanctuary of his personal freedom and creativity. The sole purpose of all human history, according to Hegel, was to bring about climaxes in the self-realization of the free individual and to realize Leibniz's dream of closing the gap between the world as it is and that which the

free individual desires⁷⁸^ The most creative of Hegel's disciples who applied Hegel's 19th century theory to the political ideology of the 20th century was a modern Italian philosopher, the Augustinian monk Giovanni Gentile⁷⁹ (1875-1944). He was a philosophy professor in Rome at the fall of the Eternal City on June 4, 1944, and was as directly a victim of the war as Hegel had been indirectly, succumbing to the cholera epidemic that spread to Central Europe from the battlefields of the Russo-Polish War of 1830-1831.

Lenin immersed himself in the study of Hegel - a philosopher who was understood in Germany, Italy and France, but never really in England, the USA or Russia - right up to the time he left Zurich in 1917 to lead the Jewish-Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia, but Lenin always honestly admitted that he had never really understood Hegel, the philosopher whose work had been plagiarized and perversely distorted by Marx. Hence it is that - although Lenin spent more time studying Hegel than any other author except Marx and Engels - there is no trace of Hegel in any of his published writings⁸⁰^

In Mill's early worldview, the state should renounce mercantilism (state socialism) and restrict its own economic activities so that the entrepreneurial class might prosper⁸^ When Engels and Marx had shown to Mill's satisfaction that his England of the Glorious Revolution of 1690 was a rotten system, the state could - according to Mill - regain all the despotic economic power of Kings Henry VIII. and Elizabeth I under the motto: "No liberty that harms others or is an obstacle to the greatest possible happiness for the greatest possible number of Englishmen. " So: the unlimited moral relativism of utilitarian pragmatism provided a convenient backdoor to the collectivist despotism known as Marxism, and none of its adherents among the presidents of the United States, from Woodrow Wilson on, had qualms about confiscatory tax policies or extra-legal immigration policies that drowned all that remained of the white race in the United States in a sea of color.

No coincidence that Wilson's favorite among the political scientists was the Englishman Bagehot, a utilitarian of the late 19th century, or that Wilson chose Leon Trotsky as his ghostwriter for the draft of the Fourteen Points, or that Wilson, the pragmatist, did not protest when the Fourteen Points - legal basis for the armistice of 1918 and subsequent peace negotiations - were then totally ignored in the Versailles Treaty of June 28, 1919⁸²^.

Historiography in the USA: "Ho/historians" and fearless critics

Scoundrels like Nathan Rothschild in England after Waterloo and John D. Rockefeller in the US after the Civil War could never have gained defacto economic control of their respective countries without the permissive morality

common to Quesnay and Bentham, and this insight is useful in analyzing Gustavus Myers' scholarly and historically meticulous account of, how a series of brazen plutocratic miscreants managed to rape and pillage the midsection of the glorious, virgin continent of North America from the first permanent settlement at Jamestown (1607).

There was already a brilliant line of honorable, public-spirited and constructive critics of the American plutocratic oligarchy and its malefactors of great wealth before Myers began publishing his comprehensive three-volume investigation during the presidency of William Howard Taft. The most brilliant of these precursors was undoubtedly Ida Tarbell, whose serialized revelations about the notorious Rockefeller clan became a crucial aid to Robert LaFollette's movement - the short-lived American Progressive Movement (1900-1912), the only movement in U.S. history so far to put first the claim that American leaders should and could be decent people. Theodore Roosevelt, a rich snob and morally rotten to the core and open to any corrupt influence, slandered Ida Tarbell (an expert in

The Rockefeller's) and Lincoln Steffens (an expert on the ubiquitous bribery and corruption of city councils in the USA) as muck-rakers. Roosevelt - as the Republican boss of New York State, Roscoe Conkling, who called reform movements "ravings" - hated any real reform and any kind of honesty in American politics⁸³.

The tendency to lie on the part of the so-called court historians of the USA has shrouded all important American issues of the 20th century in darkness. The majority of American professional historians, and especially the historians' lobby, the American Historical Association, have whitewashed the U.S. plutocratic oligarchy just to keep getting paid and avoid persecution. In doing so, they often sink deeper than mere self-preservation would require. One example: The late Admiral Samuel Eliot Morison, a Harvard historian who wanted to take the job of writing the official American naval war history of World War II away from his more competent Princeton colleague Harold Sprout⁸⁴, promised President Frank Roosevelt in 1942, that if only he and not Sprout wrote the work, there would be no criticism of Roosevelt's crimes against international law⁸⁵. Morison got the job, even though - unlike Sprout - he had no previous outstanding work on naval war history, and he was also given the coveted rank of Naval Admiral. Morison was fully aware, when he made his dishonorable offer, that the U.S. had committed violations of international law, war crimes as well as crimes against humanity, by backing the hapless Japanese into a corner and driving them against their will to their desperate step of Pearl Harbor.

Morison's moral relativism and utter depravity were demonstrated again in

1948 in a savage attack⁸⁶ on his former teacher Charles Austin Beard for his courageous and scholarly books on the criminality of FDR's foreign policy 1937-1941^{87^}

Charles Beard was the only American scholar to be president of both the American Historical Association and the American Political Science Association, and yet in 1948 he was dragged through the mud by his former student Morison in a way that had never happened to any scholar before. Beard died of a stroke shortly after Morison's widely publicized attack. Letters in my possession from the valiant widow Mary Beard - also a first-rate historian with brilliant publications - confirm that after Beard's deep shame over the horrific and barbaric World War II record of the U.S., Morison's Judas-like attack was all that was needed for Beard to collapse and die.

The story of Morison and Beard is typical of the general state of academic unfreedom in the USA, as brilliantly described by John Sachs⁸⁸. The Hoggan Research Institute has original documents in its archives that document several hundred other cases of the same kind. Morison's case of intellectual atrocity is only typical of the academic unfreedom that has prevailed and continues to prevail in the 20th century - especially since the attack on Pearl Harbor, widely regarded as the greatest victory for Jewry in history^{89^}

US court historians like George Mowry⁹⁰ and Arthur Link⁹¹ deliberately and perversely rob the American Progressive Movement of its proper meaning by claiming that the two master liars and scoundrels Teddy Roosevelt and Woody Wilson were progressives. American professional historians are universally removed from universities and colleges if they reveal to their students that America's sacred cow, the hoax of Roosevelt's and Wilson's progressivism, is untrue. As Porter Sargent Sr, until his death America's leading expert on education, put it, there is an ongoing battle to control-or free from control-the minds of America's youth. The battle would be lost to the U.S. establishment if a significant number of American students realized the truth that there once was indeed a decent political movement in the U.S., but that it was stifled by the combined efforts of Teddy Roosevelt and Woody Wilson (despite their ugly personal enmity) - the same men who are now called the leaders of progress in the U.S. by American court historians.

The reason why, in any honest history of the United States, 1912 would have to be the year of the death of the Progressive movement is that in the course of that year "Fighting Bob" LaFollette, who was about to be nominated and elected President of the United States,⁹² was eliminated as a serious contender in American federal politics by the machinations and deceptions of Teddy Roosevelt and Woody Wilson. Later, during the United States' criminal participation in World War I, LaFollette was publicly denounced by Wilson and Roosevelt. Roosevelt died in 1919, Wilson in 1924. LaFollette did run for the

presidency for a third party in 1924 - hoping to do something to repeal the shameful Treaty of Versailles and introduce cleanliness into American politics - an achievement that earned him over five million electoral votes. Yet for twelve years he had been vilified fiercely and incessantly by the Jewish media, and his position was like that of Prussian Foreign Minister von Radowitz (1797-1853), who confessed on the eve of the Olomouc Convention of 1850 that he felt like a soldier going into battle with the absolute certainty of defeat.

Olmütz buried the German nationalist movement of 1813-1850. Bismarck had to start all over again in 1862 and do everything on his own to just get his Little Germany (1862-1871). LaFollette's electoral defeat in November 1924, a foregone conclusion like Olmütz, merely buried the vestigial remnants of progressivism. Just as in 1848 the survival (with Russian help) of the Habsburgs ruling in Vienna was the death knell for Heinrich von Gagern's⁹³ dream of Greater Germany, so Roosevelt and Wilson's machinations of 1912 were the death knell for LaFollette's dream of a decent federal government in the USA. The stupid and criminal aggressions against Germany would never have happened-every time England started world wars against Germany, in 1914 and 1939-had LaFollette won the deserved presidential election victory in 1912; the English ability to destroy the world would have destroyed itself by 1916 at the latest without illegal American aid in violation of international law[^].

The finances of the "founding fathers"

As important as the work of the so-called Muck-rakers was in preparing the ground for the wide reception of Gustavus Myers' work, perhaps even more significant was an epochal piece of historical research done at the same time by Charles Austin Beard and published in two comprehensive books⁹⁵. These two volumes are widely regarded by professional historiographers as the best historical works ever written in the United States - even though Teddy Roosevelt and Woody Wilson were outraged when they appeared and various unsuccessful attempts were made by court historians after World War II to take away their aura. What Beard did in the first book is nothing more than an analysis of the economic status of each of the 55 delegates to the Philadelphia Convention of 1787, which adopted the present U.S. Constitution without plenary power. He made biographical studies of each delegate and had no difficulty in proving that they were wealthy men.

Beard then explained, and documented irrefutably, that the main reason these delegates favored the elimination of the existing Constitution at all costs-namely, the legally enacted Articles of Confederation of 1781-was none other than this: Those Articles left control of economic affairs to the Thirteen States,

and it would have been difficult for the wealthy American evildoers of the 18th century to control state governments. It would have been difficult for the rich American evildoers of the eighteenth century to control the national administrations. The issue was pressing, for the delegates-who had only authorized each other, but had no popular mandate-were intent on committing a colossal fraud at the expense of the American people: they wanted to redeem federal and state bonds to the tune of 75,000,000 dollar pari-an astronomical sum in those days when a dollar a week was considered a very good wage and the entire population of the United States, including Negro slaves and white indentured servants, was less than four million.

Since the middle of the War of Independence ten years ago, the rumor had been deliberately spread that there would be no such redemption and that the value of the war bonds, which had been subscribed by ordinary citizens, would eventually fall to zero. So it was easy for the delegates' agents to buy up these bonds at an average of S percent of their face value, which meant a profit of almost 2000 percent if the bonds were ever redeemed. There had already been an armed insurrection, led by Daniel Shays, against the local plutocrats in Massachusetts in 1786, and there were new insurrections in Pennsylvania, Virginia, and elsewhere when the national debt was paid par in the 1790s. Thus, a strong federal regime with a strong police power was the real intent of the delegates. The specific content of the seven articles of the draft constitution - today's US Constitution - was summarily and conveniently taken from Montesquieu's 1748 book by Virginia's delegate, J ames Madison, later OS president number four. Madison's later predecessor in the presidency, Thomas Jefferson, was in France when the non-authorized convention met in Philadelphia, but in correspondence with Madison he approved its work, but also proposed two amendments that were not adopted⁹⁶. All of the Philadelphia delegates, especially Benjamin Franklin, were on record as hating, despising and abhorring democracy⁹⁷.

George Washington and his plutocratic successors

In his follow-up volume, Beard proved that President Thomas Jefferson and his Anti-Federalist Party, which succeeded the Federalist presidencies of George Washington (1789-1797) and John Adams (1797-1801) in 1801, were just as much plutocratic oligarchs as the Federalists. Here Beard cited the excellent reasoning of various agrarian critics of Jefferson from the Virginia of the time and also described how Jefferson - the supposed equalizer who wanted to see mankind reduced to an Adam and Eve, if that was the only way to preserve freedom - that this Jefferson owned far more than his due in black

slaves and indentured servants (white slaves sent over from England as prisoners), and that he became very angry when his landless white tenants, who came to pay their interest, did not take off their hats.

While it can be argued that U.S. foreign policy during the first 72 years under the new Constitution until the Civil War in 1861 was, on the whole, quite reasonable⁹⁸, no honest scholar can pretend that there was honesty and decency in American domestic policy, which was neither better nor worse during the founding decades than later during the more than four generations from the end of the Civil War in 1865 to the present. Most repulsive is the Hollywood glorification⁹⁹ of the American "frontier" after 1800, for the reality was the exact opposite: yellow-skinned types and dirt-eaters, whose skin color and dirt-eating came from chronic malnutrition, were hunted, because they had no land ownership rights, from Tennessee to Oregon in the far west, train after train^^

Myers stated in the preface to his three-volume work that it was his intention "to present a sufficient number of examples to show the general character of the established class, as well as the methods which have been employed¹⁰¹". He very wisely warned that "as time passes and the power of the propertied oligarchy grows greater and greater, more and more deliberate attempts will be made to make the origin of this property appear to be the result of honest toil and great public merit¹⁰²". Myers concluded his preface with a casually suave remark: "The nature and quality of the methods and of the successful rulers, as they inevitably bring this particular civilization forward, are pointed out in these remarks." ¹⁰³

At the time of his death in 1799, George Washington was the richest man in the USA with vast land holdings in 8 of the 13 original US states¹⁰⁴. Washington was already a rich man when his small veteran army froze and starved at Valley Forge in Pennsylvania - 1777-1778, just before France saved the American cause, which was lost without his help, by entering and financing the war. Washington could easily have provided for all the good soldiers out of his own pocket during that terrible winter, but instead was incessantly busy pestering the U.S. Congress with a variety of personal desires for rewards and further enrichment. An extensive literature proves that Washington in retirement was far more filthy and cruel to his many Negro slaves (except for one slave and the son she bore him) than the average American plantation and slave owner¹⁰⁵. Myers noted that during the seven colonial American generations up to independence, land ownership (the specialty of the early U.S. presidents from Virginia- Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe) and commerce (the source of the wealth of the first two Massachusetts presidents-

John Adams and his son John Quincy Adams) had been the main sources of great American fortunes¹⁰⁶. Myers described the "exultation . . . In 1619 the plantation owners were introduced to ...a Dutch ship ...a cargo of negroes from Guinea¹⁰⁷". Thus the American experiment in Virginia was spoiled almost from the start - a year before the Devonshire Pilgrims, after seven years in Holland trying in vain to compete economically with the natives, disembarked at Plymouth Rock, Massachusetts (1620).

The slave trade of the "Pilgrim Fathers"

These so-called Pilgrim Fathers (Anglican dissenters who simply broke away from the English Established Church rather than attempting to reform it as the Puritans did) became actively involved in the profitable Negro slave trade with the West Indies and Virginia soon after landing in Massachusetts-as indeed merchants from Plymouth, England, their home district, had been involved in the slave trade since 1570. In fact, the hope of profitable participation in the slave trade was the main motive for the Pilgrim Fathers' emigration from Holland to America, and many of the first settlers soon bought their own slaves for hard labor in the woods and homes. The Puritans arrived in Massachusetts from 1630 and they too immediately plunged into the profitable business with the Negro slaves. So the experiment in Massachusetts was morally depraved from the very beginning, and that should come as no surprise to anyone: Nothing decent could develop from the legacy of Anglo-Norman Elizabethan England.

The Virginia London Company, which oversaw the introduction of black slavery into the land of the future, America, was dissolved in 1620, and Virginia became an English royal province¹⁰⁸. During the years of legal Negro slavery in the American South (1619-1865 - a period of 246 years after all), the merchants of New England grew rich from it, and their majority only pretended to abhor it as an institution during the last 30 years of slavery, after it had been abolished de jure in the British Empire¹⁰⁹.

Slavery in early Virginia was never limited to Negroes. There were four socioeconomic classes: 1) the wealthy planters, 2) poor but free whites, 3) poor whites who were so-called indentured servants but de facto slaves, and 4) Negro slaves. After 1700, a sizable free Negro population also developed, composed of emancipated former slaves, and many of these freed Negroes acquired slaves themselves and practiced slavery¹¹⁰. Tobacco was the staple product of the early days - it could buy people and things of all kinds. For example, in the early days of the Virginia colony, the British government sent 60 carefully selected, racially valuable young white women from the permanent English concentration camps as established by Queen Elizabeth I. These women were treated as Negro slaves. These women were publicly auctioned off like Negro

slaves at prices between 120 and 160 pounds of tobacco (one pound of tobacco was thus worth one pound of young female flesh). The market value of tobacco was three shillings per pound, so that a young, healthy, pretty white slave could be bought for 18 English pounds sterling"[^].

The slave plantations in Virginia were extensive during the first generation after the beginning of white settlement, and plantations of 50,000 or 60,000 acres were not uncommon[^] One privileged individual, Lord Baltimore, was granted ownership of the entire neighboring southern colony of Maryland^{m ^} To this must be added the subsequent seizure of Maryland's neighboring colony of Delaware by the Dupont family - Delaware, which had originally been settled by Swedes and Finns (the latter invented the so-called American blockhouse); because the entire state of Delaware remained firmly under the political and economic control of the Dupont company after the Second World War, which came under fire after 1945 for the huge number of German patents that it appropriated without compensation.

The rich Dutch on the east coast

Meanwhile, in the colony of New Amsterdam (called New York after 1664), a faux Dutch landowning aristocracy emerged. After the second Dutch war against the English in the 17th century (the first, undecided, in Cromwell's time), New Amsterdam was handed over to London and became New York, but in exchange for a British colony that was far more valuable in the 17th century world, Surinam in South America, later known as Dutch Guiana. Many of the Dutch in New York retained their socio-economic advantage even under British sovereignty. One example: the eighth US president, Martin Van Buren (1837-1841)^{114^} He was a wealthy man of pure Dutch descent, although his family had lived in America for eight generations. In contrast, the Roosevelts - both the Theodore and the Franklin branches - were predominantly of English blood due to a long succession of English marriages.

Any enterprising Dutchman of the 17th century, even if he belonged to the lowest classes in his home country, could become a *patroon* (land aristocrat) in A.me-ricai[^] All the young Dutchman had to do was persuade fifty of his less resourceful relatives or acquaintances to settle under his leadership on a particular piece of land - and this was not difficult to achieve, given the Dutch population explosion of the 17th century¹¹⁶. Unlike the Dutch East India Company, "whose exploitation of the Dutch possessions constituted a long list of horrors", the Dutch West India Company was relatively easy-going and limited its mercantilist restrictions to a few prohibitions on the *patroons'* involvement in the lucrative fur trade or textile manufacturing, which were a

monopoly of the home country¹¹⁷. The original 17th century province of New York was an excellent timber country at a time when European Holland maintained a merchant fleet of 1 0,000 ships with 180,000 seamen, so the *patroons* made good profits exporting timber. After 1664 they had an equally good timber market in Ellg- land, which was growing as a maritime power[^]

The villainous Kiliaen van Rensselaer, whose ambition and greed were boundless, had a modest fortune from the Amsterdam pearl trade. He managed to land a fantastic coup in America in 1630: His American agent acquired land for him 24 miles away on the right (western) bank of the picturesque, great Hudson River. Rensselaer's Hudson property extended 48 miles into the country and covered an area of 700,000 acres. On its soil lay several counties (districts) of the later state of New York as well as the provincial and state capital of Albany. The price for all this land had been a few knives and hatchets for the Indians living there⁹ Rensselaer and his kind, who had been nothing in their homeland, were now soon "surrounded and served by their retainers, agents, tenants and slaves, living in princely and dissolute style, and in almost every respect recognizing no law but their own unrestrained will¹²⁰". Large landed estates lasted a long time, especially under the English system after 1664, because "the laws of feudal tenure and primogeniture, which were then in full force, had the effect of keeping the estates intact and retaining their ancestral influence for generations to come¹²¹".

The Dutch West India Company, though small in comparison to the huge Dutch East India Company, had over one hundred sailing full-rigged ships under contract to supply patroons in the New York area in 1629, as well as fifteen thousand sailors and soldiers in its service¹²¹. Myers notes in particular that it "consumed more than one hundred thousand pounds of gunpowder that year-an indication of the grim kind of business that was being done (in 1621 the war between Spain and England resumed after twelve years of truce)¹²³." The Dutch at home soon resented the parvenu manners of their colonial gang in America, but the damage was done, the patroons had their own flags and forts, and the new settlers who arrived after 1650 found themselves more humiliated than they had been in the plutocratic Dutch-Calvinist caste society in Europe¹²⁴. The patroons issued an outrageous ordinance in 1659 requiring immigrant laborers to deposit 1,000 guilders each to obtain citizenship, and because no one could naturally afford this, these newcomers remained passive exploited subjects instead of becoming active citizens in the new American freedom¹²⁵.

In the Puritan-Calvinist New England of the Pilgrim Fathers, conditions were very similar to Dutch-Calvinist New York, and common to both regions was the fatally reactionary concept of election by grace of John Calvin, the plutocratic tyrannical ruler of Geneva - the concept that the visible wealth

accumulated in this world was a clear indication of who were the elect who were to receive the lion's share of blessings in the other world. Two hundred years later, the Baptist-Calvinist evildoer John D. Rockefeller Sr. had this in mind when he replied to American newspapermen who asked him about the sources of his wealth that God had given him his money¹²⁶. The ambitious alleged religious refugees of the Puritans and Pilgrim Fathers had a greedy appetite for all things material. Although the Naragansetts and other friendly Indian tribes had taught them how to farm (the Massachusetts settlers were overwhelmingly townspeople and traders with no concept of agriculture) and how to survive in the New England climate - which was extremely harsh compared to the climatic conditions in England and the Netherlands - by the mid-17th century the Puritan-Pilgrim Fathers oligarchy, no sooner established in their new American slave-trading base, brought the Indians of Massachusetts into the United States. century the Indians of Massachusetts - according to the recipe that the great poet Germany, Friedrich Schiller, formulated it best: The Moor has done his duty, the Moor can go^^

Mammon ruled America from the very beginning

Myers was absolutely correct in his summary observation that the wealthy Calvinists of New England soon imitated the style of English gentry that the Puritans in England had once so despised¹²⁸. Conditions were equally depraved in New Jersey and Pennsylvania-despite the early tranquil years in the 1700s under the paternalistic protection of William Penn, the Quaker son of England's most decorated admiral. Penn's son, who inherited Penn's colonial estate, was a ruthless and greedy exploiter. North and South Carolina and Georgia quickly copied the socioeconomic caste system that had been established in Virginia during the first generation of settlement. George Oglethorpe, the proprietor-founder of Georgia, claimed to be a philanthropist with an interest in the welfare of the male and female convicts of whom the colony was originally exclusively settled (1733) before the arrival of the Austrian Salzburgers, but conditions here were so bad that the first armed uprising against his regiment took place the following year in 1734¹²⁹.

Mammon ruled America from the beginning, and great trade profits were reaped by the colonists from both the French and the English during the four Anglo-French-American wars of the 17th and 18th centuries, culminating in the elimination of France's military position on the North American continent in 1763. The American colonial plutocrats of the time were fed up with greed and easy victories and did not tolerate any interference from London. But the

English imperialists were too busy elsewhere before 1763 anyway to bother enforcing all the mercantilist laws that Parliament had begun to enact for the American continent since the 17th century. It was only when the shoe pinched, after the Peace of Paris in 1763, that the English began to enforce the old laws under duress.

Cadwallader Colden, the trouble-shooter of the English colonial administration in America, reported to the merchant lords in London on September 20, 1764, that the colonial bodies in America consisted of "hereditary legislators (plutocratic oligarchs)" and that in New York and Virginia "landowners are growing richer and more arrogant, while poverty ... has taken root and continues to grow. The colonial tax structure, though based on English common law, was even more reactionary and regressive than the system in England, with laborers and small farmers bearing 100 percent of the tax burden, which would later become the entire state of New Hampshire, resulted in sixty years of costly litigation with the Crown before the claim was finally declared null and void in 1760^^ An English police spy was granted the land that would later become the entire state of Maine. His grandson sold it in one piece to the wealthy Boston merchant and slave trader John Usher in 1677^^ Usher proclaimed on his own authority that his purchase had transformed Maine into a colony of Massachusetts. This claim was not disputed, and it remained so until the Missouri Compromise of 1820, when Maine was de jure -not de facto - repudiated by Massachusetts, only to gain a new non-slave state and thereby prevent the South from gaining a majority in the US Senate, because it was at this time that Missouri was newly admitted to the Union as a slave state 4"

This bit of introduction to American colonial history by Myers made Charles Beard's 1913-1915 thesis that theft had in fact been the primary cause of the 1787 Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia far more understandable, and that after 1801 the land-grabbing Jeffersonian slaveholders were no less rapacious in the socioeconomic realm than their bipartisan hero George Washington and than their Federalist predecessors who had served under Washington and John Adams.

The American "revolution" was just a plutocratic civil war

The American plutocracy was never seriously threatened by the conservative American revolt against English mercantilism after 1763, which culminated in the American Revolutionary War 1775-1783, nor in the new system after 1789 under the Second US Constitution, which is still in force today.

During the Revolutionary War, when the radical ferment in the country was supposedly at its height, the U.S. Congress paid 130000 pounds sterling (that is, 580000 dollars-at a time when 1 dollar was a good week's wages) for the landed rights of William Penn's heirs in Pennsylvania, and the total sum was conveniently passed on to the enormous public debt of that state, which embraced the best farmland of the later North and the largest city and first capital of the United States, Philadelphia^^

The prevailing plutocratic reaction in America in the seventies and eighties did not result in a revolution in the modern sense of the word, but in a civil war between two gangs of the American plutocracy. One of these, the American Tories, saw their best profit in maintaining political union with London (they were of course favored by the English Tory:::), while the other, the self-styled Patriots, looked for greater monetary gain in independence. They were the favorites of the English Whigs^n 6^ The majority of American colonists were undoubtedly neutral throughout this protracted conflict - just as the mass of Englishmen had been neutral during the endless York-Lancaster civil wars of the 15th century. Just as the mass of Englishmen had been neutral during the endless York-Lancaster Civil Wars of the fifteenth century, or as the French Canadians who, when asked which side they thought should win during the US invasion of French Canada (1775)137 , replied that the French colonists did not care whether London or Philadelphia ultimately triumphed - the French colonists would be mistreated, cheated and persecuted either way, not unlike the mass of other American colonists in the rebellious English colonies south of New Brunswick.

More European-French soldiers than American colonists were in the trenches against the English at the decisive battle before Yorktown in 1781. American support for the commander-in-chief, General Washington, was at all times low. He never had more than 20,000 men under arms compared to the 30,000 Germans fighting for England under General Riedesel138^ Without the support of the powerful English Whigs139 and the help of King Louis XVI, the richest monarch in Europe, George Washington's career - who was only 43 years old at the beginning of the war - would have been short-lived. Washington would have had to choose between suicide and a dislocated neck at the end of an English rope.

Blatant social injustice is rooted in the system

The institutionalized American marriage between money and blatant socioeconomic injustice was personified by Colonel William Smith. He was first given an exquisite fifty-mile estate on Nassau (now Long Island) and later became Chief Justice of the State of New York140. The 2500 year old remark of the Chinese Kung (Confucius) that more had been done for a pretty face than

had ever been done for justice was quite understandable to those Americans who had heard of beautiful Greek women of antiquity such as the Trojan Helen or the Egyptian Cleopatra, but John Adams was undoubtedly right with a thesis of one of his books¹⁴¹, namely that the average American was only interested in three good meals a day and a good woman in bed. The armed uprisings against the unjust and autocratic new establishment of the United States that took place between the Shay Rebellion of 1786 and the Whiskey Rebellion¹⁴² of 1794 were never a serious threat to the securely entrenched and insatiably voracious landowning and mercantile plutocracy of the United States. European adventurers and fugitive convicts¹⁴³ flocked to the US after 1783 because they knew that the inflated idealism of Jefferson's Declaration of Independence (1776) was nothing but grandiloquent claptrap designed to impress the crowned heads of Europe, and that Mammon, the god of greed, was the real sovereign of the new USA.

Leaving aside the fact that in recent times one particularly aggressive racial group, World Jewry, has managed to gain the upper hand over all other groups in the pluralistic USA, the basic situation of the USA under the same plutocracy-oriented political constitution has not changed significantly between 1789 and the present. The worship of the automobile in place of the former worship of the horse would be mere trivial mechanics - apart from the destruction of the natural environment by the automobile, it would not, together with Jewish OS television, form the only new ingredients in the life of the downtrodden average American, whose main preoccupations apart from the automobile and TV continue to be the three good meals a day and the good woman in bed (who is also no longer so easy to come by thanks to the sexual perversion sweeping the country, the poor diet, the poisoning of food and drink and the ravages of drugs).

The same messianic notion that Americans - who have in fact been washed up from the dregs of the entire world - are "special" makes the American of our day no less odious to foreigners than his 18th century ancestor was, and the abysmal ignorance of the mentally isolated, eternally colonial American¹⁴⁴ is still formidable despite all the superficial worldwide American communication links. FDR's cynical 1939 claim that Americans were the best-informed people in the world was - unlike his more sincere remark that with ten million dollars he could block any constitutional amendment¹⁴⁵ - a perverse inversion of the truth. German SS officers in 1943-1945 delighted in interrogating US officers who were prisoners of war because, although usually college graduates, they had no idea of the European civilization they were trying to destroy¹⁴⁶.

The English crown agent in New York, Bellomont, had complained to the English merchant lords on November 28, 1700 about the "intolerably corrupt

sale of the lands of this province¹⁴⁷. By this time, however, it was already too late. The model for America's next three centuries was already in place. For example, in 1849 in Monterey/Alta California, when the first constitution of the state of California was being discussed, extensive land was reserved as the financial basis for a future Californian general school system - according to the principles that James Carter and Horace Mann had introduced in Massachusetts and New York during the 1830s. But before the second California state constitution was drafted and adopted in Sacramento in 1879, all these lands had been seized by corrupt and rapacious legislators, hardly any of whom cared one iota about the future education of California's children-except their own¹⁴⁸. The result in 20th century California has been confiscatory property taxes to maintain an educational system that has become one of the worst and most unsuccessful in the world: the decrepit and perversely incompetent California school system, sustained by an annual budget of well over a billion dollars.

Robert Livingston, who, like George Washington, was descended from a drunken Anglican clergyman who had been hounded out of office, was able to acquire the second largest land holdings in the whole of New York State after Rensselaer through fraud in the 18th century. Unlike stony England, much of New York and all of Pennsylvania were excellent farmland and meant to the North what Virginia was to the South^ Livingston was "unscrupulous, skillful and adaptable" ¹⁵⁰ He left a landed estate "of such colossal value that it was concealed in order not to further agitate the discontented people" ¹⁵ Myers found that the two main characteristics of the US establishment of the first generation after independence were these: "the arbitrary keeping of the many out of the country" and a "supercilious contempt" for the "classes of tillers and laborers"^{TM2}. Whereas a farm laborer in the New York area worked 16 hours a day and around 1800-thanks to inflation in the wake of the redemption of the public debt-might earn only about 40 cents a day, a skilled carpenter could hope for no more than 52 cents for the same sixteen-hour day, and even the blacksmith and the shoemaker - the two most pampered craftsmen before the Civil War of 1861-1865 because of the importance of horseshoes and footwear for nomadic horses and itinerant people - earned no more than 70 and 73 cents respectively for 16 hours of daily labor.

This kind of statistic must be kept in mind when estimating the fortune left by George Washington at \$500,000 and the aforementioned speculative gain of the fathers of the Constitution of 1787 at nearly 2000 percent-that time when Alexander Hamilton, Washington's autocratic and arrogant Secretary of the Treasury, managed to repay the federal and state debts at par thanks to the enactment of the Union Constitution (1789) with its strong executive, the wealthy and respected friend of Hamilton, President Washington. Crucial to the

plutocratic-oligarchic success of the new regime was that it usurped almost all the economic and financial powers of the state legislatures, and it should not be forgotten that the seizure of power by the present US regime began with the successful coup of the Philadelphia Assembly and the enactment of the new Constitution in 1789, notwithstanding the fact that of the few who voted for it, of the few who were allowed to vote on it, a majority had opposed it^^ Certainly, Thomas Jefferson was on a diplomatic mission to France 154 when his best friend and eventual successor as president, James Madison, drafted more than 90 percent of the new federal constitution and persuaded all but 3 of the 55 delegates to adopt it in Philadelphia in 1787. But Jefferson's only two objections, when he received a copy from Madison in the mail, were along the lines of more - not less - power for the federal government at the expense of the ostensibly sovereign individual states of the Union^^

Later, in 1798, during John Adams' presidency, Jefferson and Madison drafted their Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions in favor of greater states' rights, but these were nothing more than platonic partisan gestures in the context of Jefferson's own presidential bid-which succeeded two years lateri56^ Elected president in 1800, it was then the same Jefferson who declared in his inaugural address on March 4, 1801, "We are all Federalists. We are all Republicans (Anti-Federalists). "

The emergence of the American two-party system

As in England, the two-party system in the US is only a façade hiding the power and money claims of secret rival cliques within the same plutocratic oligarchy. Although the delegates in Philadelphia in 1787 had been opposed to having political parties at all - on the grounds that parties might be a demagogic mischief with dangerous and criminal democratic tendencies -:- the adoption of English common law and the permanent political pull of England together were strong enough to allow the same sham two-party system to flourish very soon in both countries. The English two-party system was kept artificially separate from the more popularly opinionated multi-party systems of France, Italy and Germany by a variety of cruel and restrictive laws against third parties, imposing heavy fines on them, for example, if their candidates failed to achieve a certain percentage of the vote in each of hundreds of House of Commons constituencies.

In the US, it was the famous Montesquieu doctrine of separation of powers that automatically favored the two-party system, without the need for special restrictive laws, and discouraged third parties for a clear reason: The power vested in the fully independent federal executive branch - the president - was so

enormous that a party with limited time in Congress either had to grow so fast that it could win the presidency within a generation and thus replace one of the two established parties, or else shrink and disappear. The modern Republican Party (GOP157), founded in Ripon, Wisconsin in 1854, managed to oust the American Whigs forever in the Union election of 1860, but no such successful ousting has occurred during the five succeeding generations, and Americans have remained victims of the permanent Democratic-Republican syndrome, with these two dominant parties merely serving the same plutocratic lobbies and pressure groups and denying the people any real representation at the federal level^^

The Labour Party in England managed to replace the Liberals in the 1920s as part of the upheaval that accompanied England's decline in the First World War, particularly after the devastating English defeat at the Somme in 1916159-but this has remained the only successful displacement since the emergence of the English two-party system after the supposedly glorious revolution of 1688-1690^

A nation of have-nots in a land of the upper river

Meanwhile, the high price the average American had to pay for land in the United States had become the dominant theme of American history from its beginnings in the 17th century right up to the 20th century. One need only consider the absurdity that in 1848 the United States had grown to 3 million square miles - an area fifteen times the size of France - but at the same time the majority of the rural population of the United States was still without land as a result of plutocratic land speculation and exorbitant land prices. France, where in 1848 the majority of the rural population consisted of peasant landowners and their families, had 36 million inhabitants at that time - around 20 million fewer than today. The US, where at least two-thirds of the land in 1848 was excellent farmland, had a population of only 21 million (non-slaves), 15 million less than France and 195 million less than today. And yet, thanks to the insatiable greed of its plutocratic oligarchy and legal, fiscal and tax system, the US of 1848 was no match for the more egalitarian land ownership system of far older France.

Land ownership in the USA in the 20th century has deteriorated further from its bleak state in the 19th century. Ferdinand Lundberg161 was not exaggerating when he observed that the average American owned nothing but his clothes and a few pieces of furniture. Of those who drove cars, few had no installments to pay, and only a tiny percentage of Americans owned any piece of urban or rural land mortgage-free.

No wonder there were so many illegal land occupations and so much restless and aimless wandering from region to region in the 19th century. People were literally driven nomadic by their inability to call anything permanent in the US their own. This in the first place - and not some legendary virility - is the cause of the explosive and aggressive "frontier" of the 19th century. However, this does not exclude the importance of the racial factor among the newcomers to the USA. Harold Underwood Faulkner¹⁶² has shown, on the basis of extensive and reliable American census material, that among European immigrants after 1800, Germans and Scandinavians became the boldest, most enterprising and successful "men of the frontier". In the decades leading up to 1890 (which Frederick Jackson Turner scientifically established as the end of the American "frontier"), the proportion of Germans and Norwegians who moved out to the "frontier" soon after their arrival in the United States ranged from 75 to 90 percent, while the proportion was 50 percent for the English and less than 15 percent for the Irish.

Jewish immigration

The great Jewish settlement movement to the USA only began in 1882 after the assassination of the Russian "Tsar Liberator" Alexander II by Jewish terrorists, i.e. just a few years before the end of the American "frontier"¹⁶³. There were certainly Jews in America before the founding of Boston in 1630, as Werner Sombart (1863-1941), the great German economic historian, pointed out in his many studies on the history of Western capitalism after the Lutheran Reformation^ The US census of 1870 revealed only 250000 Jews - forty years later there were already millions.

The tenth ship to reach New Amsterdam after its founding in 1609 had only Jewish passengers on board, and while there were no Jewish "frontiersmen" of the stereotypical Hollywood variety, Jewish peddlers were hawking their wares on the Kentucky frontier of 1790 in much the same way as they did on the Cossack frontier in Eurasia around the same time. Sombart's studies - one of which was devoted exclusively to the economic role of world Jewry - prove that the Jews were not innovators in modern business (just as Richard Wagner had already shown that they were not pioneers in modern art), and that after the lifting of all restrictions on the participation of Christians in money-lending around the middle of the 18th century, there could no longer be any serious question of the parasitic Jews being a useful catalyst of modern economic growth. The fact that German Jews left Europe en masse during the six years before the Second World War did not hinder Hitler's successful socio-economic

experiment - rather the opposite was the case. So the modern Jewish prophet from Vienna, Theodor Herzl (1860-1904), founder of Zionism, was right in his realization that the Jews would be laughed at by the rest of the world not only because of their proverbial greed and proverbial physical ugliness, but also because of their chauvinistic claim that they had no homeland but were the master race of the earth. The modern Jews had yet to prove that they could organize a society on their own. Herzl hesitated to let the Jews take possession of the small, civilized and highly developed Arab Palestine, which had only 5 percent Jews in 1914. He wished them a "frontier" territory like Madagascar, which would enable them to somehow prove themselves. The experiment in Israel after 1948 offered no opportunity for this, because the Jewish society there has never even come close to getting on its feet financially through its own efforts, the country was soaked in the blood of a few hundred thousand Arabs and has never been able to attract a significant percentage of the world's Jewish population. Hundreds of thousands of unfortunate Jews from Africa and Asia were transported there against their will to work for a small European-American Jewish elite, and Israel depended on the US and Germany for its military protection and economic well-being^

The so-called American Old Immigration (1602-1882) came mainly from northwestern Europe and almost coincides with the "frontier" period of American history up to 1890, which was studied in detail by F. J. Turner in 1893. The so-called New Immigration was different mainly in that such a large proportion was Jewish, but it also showed a substantial Slavic and Sicilian-Napolitan influx that was absent during the previous period.

Myer's examination of economic conditions in the US from colonial times to the 20th century shows why world Jewry flourished so rapidly in its massive emigration to the US after 1882, becoming economic and political masters of the US within 30 years. If there had been a genuine racial-ethnic community in the USA of the 1980s and subsequent decades, and if the law had ruled there, then the rapid and complete Jewish takeover of such a huge country would have been unthinkable. However, the US of those years was a thoroughly corrupt plutocratic oligarchy where the human rights of the average citizen were mocked under a viciously unclean judicial system, a regressive and outdated tax system, and a political system that was completely indifferent to decency and honor on the part of the dominant political leaders from both major parties.

This moral and spiritual chaos, hypocrisy and corruption provided an ideal plundering ground for the aggressive world Jewry, which merely seized its opportunity. In the Roman Empire, Jewish influence is recognizable even before the birth of Christ, but it never became even remotely comparable to what Judaism achieved through the election of Woodrow Wilson as president in

1912 in the USA, the richest plutocratic bastion on earth. The institutional scheme that made this Jewish success possible was in place long before the main stream of Jewish immigration to the US began in 1882.

"Boston Anglomania"

It was of particular significance that the Boston merchants had become the richest in the American colonies before the end of the 17th century. John Hancock, who was the first to sign the Declaration of Independence in 1776, had 1,000 people on his personal payroll in Boston at the time. But Boston was not only a city that had become rich through the wicked trade in slaves and narcotics, it also became the center of American Anglomania following the infamous Hartford Convention of 1814. At that time, in the middle of the war, the governors of the New England states met in Hartford/Connecticut and threatened to secede their region from the Union if Virginian President James Madison did not immediately make peace with England in Ghent/Netherlands due to English conditions that denied the USA its war aims - free seas without chronic English restrictions and violations of the law, including requisitioning¹⁶⁹. Madison acquiesced to New England's blackmail, and from 1814 to 1914, in the face of powerful northeastern American Anglomania, it remained constantly doubtful whether the United States could preserve its own sovereignty from the encroachments of modern British imperialism. The patriotism of the Boston "Tea Party" of 1773-a violent resistance to English mercantilist insolence-had been set in motion by a spirited leader, Sam Adams, and the English Redcoats' march on Concord 15 months later-which opened the American Revolutionary War-had the purpose of capturing and killing Sam Adams, Sam Adams later led the unsuccessful struggle in New England against the Philadelphia Constitution of the plutocratic oligarchy-now the U.S. Constitution-but when he died in 1800, the patriotic spirit of Boston was laid to rest with him.

Disloyal Boston Anglomania was a blight on the United States long before the Hartford Convention of 1814, as evidenced, for example, by the fact that a majority of New England congressmen voted against President Jefferson's purchase of Louisiana from France in 1803, on the grounds that this acquisition - which more than doubled the territory of the USA - could be seen as an unfriendly gesture against England^^ When Abraham Lincoln was elected president in 1860 in a four-party election as the candidate of a minority party with the campaign promise he would destroy the socioeconomic system of the American South, the Southern states reluctantly exercised their sovereign right of self-determination and seceded from the Union, but only after calling for

general elections to special constitutional conventions for each state for that purpose. Bostonians clamored loudest at this time, although the New England governors including Massachusetts were willing to take their states out of the Union by decree - and New England has always been proud of this action rather than condemning it. So it came to pass that along with its Anglomania after 1800, Boston also discovered a taste for English cant and hypocrisy.

The true background to the North-South conflict

Boston plutocrats suddenly became obsessed overnight with hatred of the American South-the moment the agitation of the Wilberforce movement in England achieved the largely platonic emancipation of millions of colored slaves in the British Empire in 1834. These same plutocrats a generation later used the anti-slavery landless farmer Abraham Lincoln of the Upper South¹¹² (born in Kentucky in 1809) as their docile instrument for the political annihilation of the South, just as they were at the same time sponsoring the terrorist campaigns of the wild-abolitionist fanatic John Brown (who Robert E. Lee caught and hanged in 1859 after an incursion into the South). The wealthy Boston plutocrats knew that Lincoln was their man, and when William Seward of New York, the original leader of the new anti-Southern Republican Party founded in 1854, began to moderate his anti-Southern stance, the plutocrats sidelined him and ran Lincoln as the new minority candidate in the 1860 presidential election, knowing full well that the South could not tolerate a President Lincoln. This was despite the fact that Lincoln had been defeated by Douglas in the 1858 Illinois election for the U.S. Senate - a defeat that normally should have ended Lincoln's sporadic political career^{^m}

That the Boston plutocrats did the right thing from their point of view is crystal clear. "It was the South's goal in 1860-1861 to withdraw from the Union without a violent confrontation with the North and the West, the latter of which was firmly under the control of the American Atlantic Coast plutocracy in 1860. In 1861, William Seward, as Lincoln's Secretary of State, urged him to refrain from violent coercive measures against the South, arguing that starting a civil war was the worst of all mortal sins and that the two separate parts could, in time, come to an agreement based on true friendship in peace and mutual understanding. Lincoln, however, was obsessed with thoughts of war. By cramming huge numbers of Union soldiers into Fort Sumter in the middle of Charleston's South Carolina harbor, he forced the war - just as Grey and Halifax were to do against Germany in 1914 and 1939 and FDR in 1941 against Japan, Italy, and Germany^{174, 11s}.

The turnaround of the Boston plutocracy against the South in the 1830s-

which was all the more remarkable because the "rum and nigger" fortunes on which this plutocracy was first and foremost based had been amassed over eight generations of long dealings with the South—was the reason for the American Civil War in the 1860s. Slavery, which was in any case coming to an end for economic reasons in both the USA and Brazil, was not the reason, and the question of protective tariffs was merely an instrument of Boston's war policy and not the cause of the war. Boston's attempt before 1861 to cut off trade between Europe and the American South was a deliberate provocation of the South. In New York City, where a pro-Southern mayor, Fernando Wood, held office until the middle of the war (until the conscientious objector riots of 1863), the atmosphere was totally different, and if the New York mood had prevailed in Boston, there would have been no war at all[^].

' Although the slave trade and rum were the most prominent ingredients, fish and opium also played their part in Boston's prosperity during the eight generations following the city's founding¹⁷⁷. Boston's export of stockfish was huge, especially to Naples and southern Europe in general, but there was no Sicilian-Napolitan emigration to America at the time because the Roman Catholic clergy warned young Italians that they would be killed in America by Protestant Yankees. At the Massachusetts General Court, the Boston building that housed first the colonial and later the state legislature, the codfish was the state emblem. The best quality cod was sold to the Catholic countries of Europe, while the poorer quality went to the British Antilles to feed the Negro slaves¹⁷⁸. The Boston opium trade to the detriment of the Chinese people¹⁷⁹ was based on the approval that England's cruel imperialism in China found among the Boston plutocrats, and on the intention of the English to leave part of the huge booty to the Boston merchants. In a criminal enterprise, such as 19th century English imperialism in China, the more accomplices you have, the better you look in the world, and the crime is then covered up under the euphemism of the "good understanding of nations".

Boston's other successful trade products were timber and whale oil¹⁸⁰^ The whaling ships spent one and a half to three years on fishing voyages, freely circumnavigating Cape Horn, and individual ships often returned with no less than 1250 barrels of the valuable whale oil. Similarly, the ever-growing European commercial and military sailing ship fleets provided an excellent market for American timber well into the 19th century. It was a truism that a Boston merchant could lose a ship, crew and cargo, and still make a handsome profit if only two of his other ships succeeded. But while the wealth of these Boston "Brahmins" swelled (they gave themselves this name, just as they boastfully referred to Boston as the center of the universe), the poor of Massachusetts were cruelly punished under the system of imprisonment and workhouses adopted from England. Although this system was theoretically

abolished in 1844, it continued in practice for many years in the East, Midwest and post-war South. During the presidency of Andrew Jackson (1829-1837), the courts sent 75,000 people to prison each year for owing money. Half of these owed less than 20 dollars^{TM^}

Three years of hard labor, generally as a chain convict, was the minimum punishment for petty theft, and begging for alms was a serious offense punishable by imprisonment. In short: "Poverty as such was a crime¹⁸²."

"Money was the measure of all things"; the case of Stephen Girard

Wealth, however, protected against being punished for a real crime. For example, in 1838 it was proven in court that Samuel Swartwout, a revenue collector for the port of New York, had stolen \$1,222,705.69 from the US federal government, fled and lived as a fugitive for many years before being caught and brought to trial. He was released without a trial after paying a fine. But any young lad who was not satisfied with an apprenticeship he had not chosen, and breached his apprenticeship contract by leaving without the express wish of his master, was automatically sentenced to prison. As Myers succinctly put it: "Money was the measure of all things¹⁸³."

Stephen Girard, born in Bordeaux in 1750, offered a good example of what a foreign immigrant was able to achieve in the moral anarchy of the USA, where Mammon ruled. In a blatant offense against France, he sold a French merchant ship to the USA in 1776 and opened a wine shop in Philadelphia¹⁸⁴. Although the English conquered Philadelphia the following year, Girard did profitable business with both sides for the remaining six years of the war. By 1780, he had become a major player in the Negro slave trade¹⁸⁵. One of Girard's sensational coups took place in 1802 during the Negro uprising in San Domingo against French rule¹⁸⁶. Girard offered to bring the luxurious personal property of murdered French landowners to safety for their relatives. Instead, he auctioned off all these possessions on the US market for 50,000 dollars and pocketed the proceeds¹⁸⁷. He used this blood money to buy new ships for the African slave trade and the Chinese opium trade. Several of his ships sailed around the world, operating both the slave and drug trades side by side.

Initially, Girard did not trust the weak US currency and conducted his banking affairs in England, but in 1810 he had Barlows of London transfer 500,000 dollars from his English account to buy shares in the Bank of the United States. When that bank's charter was not renewed due to unusually blatant fraud and corruption, Girard opened his own private Philadelphia Girard Bank with a capital of \$1,200,000 on May 12, 1812, a month before the United States declared war on England, and again made a huge fortune doing business

with both sides in the Anglo-American War of 1812-1815. This was primarily a naval war in which American merchants either became much richer or perished. In this way, the war brought about a remarkable concentration of American commercial capital. A great merchant like Girard regarded patriotism as the luxury of fools. He himself was described around this time by a partner as "a busy, repulsive little man" 188.

France had always been betrayed by Girard, and yet his cultural roots remained there. He considered himself an atheist son of the radical wing of the French Enlightenment, although he also enjoyed the works of Voltaire (who, like Girard, had been an enormously successful securities speculator). Girard was particularly enchanted by Thomas Paine, an Englishman by birth who became a naturalized Frenchman in 1791 and died in France in 1809^^ Girard was particularly interested in Paine's French essays on scientific atheism. These were a popular sophistry in which the old Platonic syllogism was used to refute Christian theology. For example: God must by definition be perfection, but perfection cannot produce imperfection without itself becoming imperfect-ergo: God cannot have created the world. This entertaining kind of thought exercise had nothing to do with modern science, it was a mere play on words. For Girard, however, it was enough, at least as far as theology was concerned.

Myers notes that Girard was "a fierce shark" like later American plutocrats, but that, unlike them, he was not a hypocrite who sought to ingratiate himself into public favor while simultaneously deceiving that public. In this respect, Girard was a maverick like Cornelius Vanderbilt, a later plutocratic miscreant who scornfully exclaimed, "To hell with publicity!" Girard was proud of the fact that he was one of the most hated men in the USA after the War of 1812. This could not have troubled him, for he knew that the purpose of the post-1789 American system was to defy public opinion with impunity, and he knew that he enjoyed the full protection of that system^^

The publication of Girard's will in 1831 caused some surprise. He had apparently been expected to leave all his vast wealth to the students of the Marquis de Sade. Instead, each of his many French relatives inherited something, and his many American apprentices each received the handsome sum of 500 dollars. He also distributed a lot of money to American hospitals and orphanage societies. He left \$500,000 to Philadelphia for city beautification and \$300,000 to Pennsylvania for its backward canal building program in competition with New York. He created the Girard College for Orphans with an endowment of \$60,000,000, and his Louisiana property - the most valuable of his holdings with an enormous number of Negro slaves - he transferred to the later predominantly French-American city of New Orleans for its city beautification, including its famous French-language municipal theater. Given that Girard himself was no hypocrite, it is ironic that he, more than anyone else,

established the American tradition of private philanthropy (George Washington's will - a generation earlier - had completely ignored this aspect). Girard, the caustic Paine disciple, probably delighted in the idea of splitting the gullible American public's opinion of him after his death.

Johann Jacob Astor, the super shark

Much more callous in money matters than Girard was Johann Jacob Astor, who came to the USA in 1783 almost penniless and died two generations later, almost a hundred times richer than Washington at the time of his death. As with Washington, Astor's fortune consisted mainly of landed property and remained one of the largest American landed estates even after his death. Although none of Astor's descendants had his acumen, the Astor family's holdings at the beginning of the 20th century amounted to over 300,000,000 dollars, which would be more than 4500000000 dollars in today's inflationary currency¹⁹².

Astor was born in 1763 as the son of a butcher in Waldorf/Badeo in Germany. He traveled to London in 1781 to sell musical instruments imported from Germany together with his brother¹⁹³. As he could not stand his brother's condescending manner, he fled to New York City via Baltimore/Maryland after the end of the American Revolutionary War. His first job in the USA was selling cakes for the baker Georg Dietrich. His second American employer was the fur trader Robert Browne, and Astor's position with him was that of an office apprentice. The young Astor soon saw opportunities for advancement in the fur business. He carefully questioned the trappers when they came to town. Eventually, he had gained enough knowledge to persuade Browne to send him on difficult business missions to the American West and Canada. Astor then had enough experience and money to open his own store on Water Street in the New York docks in 1786, immediately targeting the rich London fur market. He knew that he could get his valuable furs even cheaper than

his unscrupulous competitors by cheating the Indians even more than they did. So he studied the accounts of the bloodthirsty early English fur traders, many of whom had left their memoirs in print. Astor used cheap Rhode Island rum as his main weapon. He aimed to make it even easier to hoodwink the Indians with government support, and on top of that, he wanted to do Washington/D. C. by eliminating as many Indians as possible[^]

Astor overcame his social parvenu status in one fell swoop by marrying Sarah Todd, the natural cousin of the immensely wealthy Dutch merchant Hendrik Brevoort. Astor employed a huge band of trappers and agents in his

1794 continent-wide campaign to both exploit and exterminate the Indians, but at the same time forced his prominent young wife to live in squalid surroundings in the rooms above the store in Water Street by the docks. It was not until 1800, when he was an enormously wealthy merchant of 37, that he relented and moved with his wife and children to 223 Broadway - the most fashionable address at the time. In addition to his investments in city properties, Astor always had plenty of liquid funds at the ready and around 1800 he always had 250000 dollars at hand without borrowing. In addition, of course, he had the best credit in all of America if necessary.

Astor's one-dollar beaver skin fetched 6.25 dollars in London, but Astor was annoyed at having to pay English or Bos-toner merchants for the freight. He therefore acquired his own large merchant fleet. He also increased his profits by investing in the manufacture of goods in England for the return freight from London, which were produced specifically for the American market. Astor understood enough about both the English production possibilities and the demand in the USA⁹⁶.

Like the English merchants and the Jewish Rothschilds in Germany,⁹⁷ Astor saw England's ongoing war against Napoleonic France as a bonanza for his trading profits, as the most unscrupulous trader always had the advantage in wartime - at a time when British naval supremacy was a permanent fixture in the economic scene. The Peace of Amiens between France and England in 1802 threatened the pace of Astor's commercial growth, dock the English did him the favor of resuming the war the following year, even though there had been no French violations of the Amiens peace agreements. On the contrary, it was the English who had violated these terms from the outset. Much to the annoyance of the Russian Tsarist Empire - Tsar Paul I. (1796--1801) was a Knight of St. John - the English had occupied Malta, the seat of this order of knights, in 1799 as part of their plan to make it more difficult for Bonaparte to withdraw from Egypt after Admiral Nelson had destroyed the French supply fleet at Abu-Kir/Egypt. Paul then contemplated an invasion of India by elite Cossack troops, but English agents assassinated the Tsar before this operation could get off the ground. Paul's son, Tsar Alexander I (1801-1825), was deterred by England from pursuing his father's plans (it would have been child's play for the Cossacks to wrest India from the weak British troops stationed there), but a deep English resentment of the Russian threat to India remained, as did a Russian resentment of the English occupation of Malta. Napoleon had proposed the evacuation of Malta as a side condition at Amiens to appease the Russians, and the British had readily agreed. The only difference was that in 1802 Napoleon seriously imagined that he was about to conclude a long-lasting peace with England (just as Hitler did in Munich in 1938), but for the English the Peace of Amiens was not worth the paper it was written on. They were just

trying to buy time after Napoleon had crushed their second European coalition at the Battle of Marengo in 1800 and were now cynically ignoring their promise to vacate Malta, which they had given of their own free will. There was a French diplomatic protest, but what difference did it make, as the two countries were soon at war with each other again anyway thanks to renewed British aggression.

William Pitt and George Canning organized their third European coalition, including Austria and Russia, but this new alliance of English puppets was also quickly destroyed by Napoleon - at Austerlitz in December 1805. England then succeeded in driving Prussia and France into war against each other in 1806, partly by manipulating the English-ruled Hanover and partly by pursuing opposing diplomacy in Paris and Berlin. After Prussia was destroyed in 1807 (only a small Prussian puppet state continued to exist under French occupation), England managed to use economic pressure to force Russia back into war against France in 1812. During the fighting around Moscow, Napoleon's military position in Europe was destroyed by the Vilna Jews, mindful of the alliance between world Jewry and England since the Paris Sanhedrin in 1807, bribing the French quartermasters in Napoleon's main supply depot at Smolensk and disappearing with all French supplies - an operation that led to the destruction of the Grande Armée[^].

The gigantic plundering train

In 1812, the USA and France became war allies against Astor's wishes, but the English beat the Americans so badly from the first days of the war and the New England Federalists so openly betrayed them that President Madison was forced to ask for peace and accept the disgraceful English terms in Ghent/Netherlands in 1814ⁱ 9 In the end, however, the War of 1812 played a decisive role in thwarting Astor's ambitions to become the richest man in the world.

His personal fortune initially continued to grow after England resumed its warfare against France. He felt that the time was ripe to monopolize the entire American fur industry and founded the American Fur Company²⁰⁰. His Oregon dream prompted Astor to boast in 1809 that he would become the richest man on earth, even richer than his friend Nathan Rothschild in England. In 1811 he completed a mighty fortress named after himself, Astoria in Oregon, at the mouth of the mighty Columbia River. At the time, Oregon was an international territory, claimed by England, Russia, Spain and the USA, but this did not bother Astor, who was still betting that the USA would not go to war against England a second time. It was Astor's plan to exterminate the entire Native

American population of Oregon within 20 years and kill all the fur-bearing animals there - just as the Russians were completing their slaughter of hundreds of thousands of otters in San Francisco Bay in Spanish Alta California at the same time. The corrupt US government was willing to continue supporting Astor, but fortunately the War of 1812 intervened. Otherwise Astor would in all probability have become the richest man on earth after 1831, when Girard died. Instead, the war came. After defeating the main American army under General William Hull at Detroit, Michigan in 1812, the British first captured and then destroyed Astoria, forever thwarting Astor's mad quest to make Oregon a desert wasteland and become the King Croesus of the 19th century. Astor continued to plan, rob and indirectly kill, and did so until his own death 35 years later, but he had passed the pinnacle of his career with the loss of the Astoria investment.

The American Fur Company was a state within the greater United States and dominated the fur trade on the Great Lakes, in the Missouri Valley and in the Southwest until Astor's death, although all of this together was only a fraction of Oregon's fur wealth. After the War of 1812, Astor's main bases in the American West were St. Louis, Detroit and Mackinac. The USA only received its piece of Oregon from England two years before Astor's death in 1848. Myers later expressed himself rather guardedly when he called Astor's exploitation of North America "one of the most arbitrary, cruel, and appalling" that "ever took place in any country."² Myers added that there had been no "Golden Age" in the early history of the United States, "as it is foolishly portrayed, but a savage competitive struggle in which every man was at the throat of his fellow man"²⁰² Astor and the other American plutocratic oligarchs expected and received a "jurisdiction ...which could be invoked rigorously against the poor", but which the rich "need not heed"²⁰ ^{^3}

It did not bother Astor that in the few years from 1815 to 1831 more than 150 of his fraudulent traders were killed by the Indians, for each of these killings thousands of Indians were massacred along with their wives and children-by the regular U.S. Army that supported Astor's operations²⁰⁴ But lest anyone assume Astor was generous to his agents who went about their dangerous business on his behalf: The average income of an agent was only \$130 a year and was paid out mostly in goods from the Astor Company's felt-lined stores²⁰⁵^ The same miser Astor enforced exorbitant tariffs against imports of foreign fur goods, keeping prices in the American domestic market 50 percent above world market prices, especially during the depression of 1837-1843. At the same time, Astor ensured that the tariff on those English goods he wished to import for the American market remained low. Astor's eldest son, William, grossly understated the case when he called President Jackson's War Department on the 25th.

November 1831 informed that the annual net profit from Astor's domestic fur

sales amounted to 500,000 dollars^{206^}.

A cruel exploiter

Astor specialized in arbitrage (currency speculation), banking and land deals in addition to his ventures in furs, ships and English imports. His land scams were numerous, and he took cruel advantage of the American economic crisis of 1837-1843 - relatively the worst in American history - by throwing thousands of city dwellers out of their homes and onto the streets^{207^} As Myers put it: On Astor's, the super shark's, track, "impoverishment, ruin and beggary were left everywhere"^{208^} In the Astor-owned part of New York alone, 10000 people were homeless and destitute in the bitterly cold winter of 1838, and hundreds died in the open²⁰⁹ Instead of offering help, Astor only accelerated his collection of mortgage debts. European emigration to the US dwindled to a thin trickle during these years-as it had earlier during the decade of Jefferson's England embargo^{2 TM}

A new flow of immigration to the USA did not begin again until 1846, when the English decided to take advantage of the Irish potato famine by using their so-called Corn Laws to block the supply of foreign grain to Ireland until 1849, thereby wiping out a third of the Irish population. The English enforced starvation of Ireland from 1846 to 1849 was identical to the Anglo-American enforced starvation of West Germany between 1945 and 1948. The more fortunate of the Irish escaped to the USA as contract workers, a form of economic slavery, but with the prospect of physical survival. 129,000 destitute people, mainly Irish contract laborers, arrived in New York Harbor in 1847, and by 1851 the number had swollen to 300,000^{^1}

Meanwhile, Astor's greed for American land after the War of 1812 had exacerbated land scarcity for the average person-just like Washington's greed for land after the Revolutionary War-in a vast country where good land could have been plentiful if there had ever been a clean, decent U.S. federal government-which it had been from its very beginning.

beginnings to the present day. The political history of the United States is a pernicious combination of bloated idealism and arrested development: the superficial, two-dimensional legacy of John Locke and a few less able French philosophers has never been overcome, there has never been a move beyond blind worship of the legendary pretended wisdom of the so-called Founding Fathers, and there has therefore been no political growth in the vital sense of ethnocentric community and social spirituality.

Scoundrels like Astor or, more recently, the immoral Rockefellers were always allowed to flourish like the Madagascan man-eating trees - at the expense of the downtrodden average American man so eloquently described by John Adams in his 1787 book. The average American was always a frustrated materialistic hedonist, running after a shadow of selfish happiness, as John Adams' friend of late years, the land-hungry plutocratic oligarch Thomas Jefferson, had advised him to do. The average American was always cheated and brutalized, while at the same time his plutocratic masters stupidly told him that the best things in life were free and that he was the luckiest creature on earth. Without this background of political and socioeconomic depravity from America's earliest beginnings, it would be forever incomprehensible how such 20th century plutocratic scoundrels as Teddy Roosevelt and Frank Roosevelt can continue to be glorified by the American media, as well as in U.S. public schools and by the country's court historians. There's a saying that says it all: Show me who you're with and I'll tell you who you are ...

Myers recalled that Astor "once he got the land, he never sold it again." ² He occasionally leased land for development projects, but never for more than 21 years. He liked to leave land in the middle of Manhatta in its original state until an irresistible pressure had built up that made leases at exorbitant interest rates possible. ² Two generations after Washington's death, Astor was worth a hundred times what this richest American of his time had been worth. In New York City alone, there were twenty-five millionaires in the 1820s. New York surpassed Philadelphia as the largest city in the US and became the business and financial capital of the country. This happened two generations before swarms of Jewish immigrants rapidly transformed this megalopolis into the world capital of a merciless and ever-aggressive global Jewry.

Astor died at 84 on March 29, 1848, shortly before the end of the American-Mexican War. At the time, Commodore Cornelius Vanderbilt ("The law is unimportant when you have power") was one of New York's 25 millionaires, worth 1.5 million dollars. When he died almost thirty years later, he was worth over 100 million dollars, making him the richest American to have reached these lofty Mammonian heights, thanks to his financial crimes during and after the American Civil War ²14.

Astor's eldest son and principal heir, William Astor, was 56 at his father's death and, like him, a miser. Astor's fortune continued to grow, not through any particular Astorian skill, but because American "society was inverted in an unseemly way" ² What Myers meant by this expression is this: Thanks to the English legal-fiscal-economic legacy, the United States was regressive: the less one earned, the more one was taxed; the less one owned, the more harshly one

was punished; the fewer corrupt plutocratic relationships one had, the more unlawful obstacles one got in the way - and always with the inevitable result that the old American trend continued unimpeded: the rich got richer, the poor got poorer. The time was coming when American individuals would own billions of dollars, but the average person would own next to nothing except his worries and debts²¹⁶^ An American scene was created that was ideal for Jewish usurers and for ambitious, unpatriotic Jewish eider statesmen in the manner of Bernard Ba- ruch²¹⁷.

Old Astor's second son, John Jacob Astor Jr., allied himself with, of all people, the degenerate Irish Tweed Gang, which had seized political control of New York City in the late 1860s in the wake of the general decline and massive corruption following the American Civil War. In 1871, this Astor headed the committee of rich men that investigated the political misdeeds of gang boss Tweed. They completely rehabilitated the Tweed scum - to the great satisfaction of their two-term OS president, the corrupt alcoholic General U.S. Grant, who had once amused Abe Lincoln with his heavy drinking and butchery strategy during the Civil War campaigns. But Astar's activity on behalf of the Tweed Gang comes as no surprise when one remembers that between 1853 and 1867 he spent a total of 500,000 dollars bribing New York State legislators to obtain lucrative transportation concessions²¹⁸.

Boss Tweed later died a poor man, but only because his lawyer Elihu Root - later Secretary of State in the corrupt Teddy Roosevelt administration - stole almost all his wealth²¹⁹. Connolly, one of Tweed's immediate aides and rehabilitated by Astor in 1871, took himself abroad to safety in 1890 with 6 million dollars in cash - money he had received from Astor and other plutocrats for favors from the city of New York²²⁰. In 1875, at the end of his life, William Astor owned 700 New York buildings and residences and many undeveloped plots of land. At his death he was praised to the skies by the degenerate American press as a great public benefactor, but only a few years later this adulation was drowned out by agitation against the terrible New York slums he had created²²¹. His two sons, John Jacob Astor 111 and William Astor Jr. each received half of his estate. On his death in 1890, John Jacob Astor 111 left his son William Waldorf Astor 150 million dollars (2 billion dollars in today's money). The latter - true to the unpatriotic tradition of his family - became an English citizen, but continued to draw a huge income from his American properties. Astar's assets in the USA amounted to more than 450 million dollars during the First World War²²².

No fewer than 6,000 people lived miserably crowded together in many a street neighborhood in New York, on exactly the same plot of land that the Astor lords used to build one of their city palaces²²³. William Waldorf Astor bought the Clive- den estate in Bucks, England, which had previously been the family

seat of the Dukes of Windsor. This estate had long been an English public park, but Astor erected high walls to keep the people out²²⁴.

The thriving of the Astarsehen criminal tribe for five generations was a perfect indicator of the triumphant progress of the American plutocratic oligarchy in war and peace, but also of the accompanying decline and degeneration of the American masses, not to mention brutalization and deadening. Out of this foul-tasting potpourri could only emerge a hellish conglomeration that cost the outside world dearly. The innate American frustration combined with resentment and aggression exploded in the 20th century at the expense of decent peoples everywhere. Of course, this American "crime corporation" performed at home and abroad with the same empty and false messianic, euphoric and inflated ideals that had characterized the American dream from its earliest beginnings. No conscientious reformer was ever able to put the brakes on this diabolical American procession that had set itself in motion in the 17th century - with the result that the 20th century USA became an evil deception and a costly one at the expense of all mankind.

Marshal Field's raids

The corruption of the Astar property scam in New York was rivaled in Chicago by the robberies of Marshall Field and Levi Leiter²²⁵. Field, the son of an impoverished farmer in Conway, Massachusetts, arrived in the then small town of Chicago in 1856 at the age of 21. He started a wholesale textile business with Levi Leiter and Potter Palmer in the years before Abe Lincoln's nomination in Chicago (1860). This nomination as the Republican presidential candidate quickly led to Lincoln's election as president and the bloody Civil War of 1861-1865, the most senseless and costly war in history up to that time²²⁶, thanks to Lincoln's unquestioning ambition and the North-South divide within the Democratic Party. Field enjoyed the war, and Myers describes how Field's company "cruelly exploited" the Chicago market under the abnormal, inflationary conditions of wartime²²⁷. Profits were so great that the destruction of all the company's buildings in the Great Chicago Fire (1871) did not cause serious problems - they were quickly replaced²²⁸. This company has been known as Marshall Field & Company since 1887. In the 19th century, it only delivered for cash, never on credit. In 1901, its annual turnover reached 50000000 dollars²²⁹. It was this trading business that gave Marshall Field the influence he needed to become the great land shark of Chicago and turn it into a slum city worse than New York²³⁰.

Apart from earlier French travel bases, the white settlement of Illinois began with Ninian Edwards and other Kentuckians who came from the south across

the Ohio River. At the time Illinois became a state, there was nothing of Chicago except the log cabin of Johann Kinzie²³¹. Three generations later, in 1900, the population of Chicago was 1000000 and land prices had skyrocketed. A quarter acre of land in the city center cost 20 dollars in 1830, 1500 dollars in 1840, 17,000 dollars in 1850, 28,000 dollars in 1860, 120,000 dollars in 1870, 130,000 dollars in 1880 and 900,000 dollars in 1890. Finally, in 1894 - one year after the great market collapse that ushered in a new six-year grim depression - the price was 1 250000 dollars. Chicago's location as the most important railroad junction in the USA was the cause of this astronomical growth. The. In 1900, the land in central Chicago was worth as much "foot for foot" as that of Manhattao in central New York²³².

Field, the master of this urban empire, treated its inhabitants with paternalistic condescension and contempt - as the example of the Puliman Corporation, which Marshall Field controlled as its main shareholder, shows²³³. George Pullman, the founder of the company, had become a mere representative figure as a result of Field's involvement. The company had been building railroad sleeping cars since 1867 and soon achieved a monopoly position. At Field's behest, the company bought 500 acres of land in the Chicago suburbs in 1880, on which a Puliman town with Puliman stores for Pullman employees was to be built. When the Depression of 1893 hit, Field immediately cut the wages of Puliman workers by 25 percent, but kept the inflated rents and utility prices in the Puliman town at their old levels. The result was the Pullman Strike of 189t one of the bloodiest in American history. Field put it down with the help of US forces. Even Mark Hanna, the reactionary Chicago Republican Party boss who put his puppet McKinley in the White House in 1897 and unleashed the War of Aggression against Spain the following year, said that only fools would live in Marshall Field's so-called Puliman Model City²³⁴.

Field's unscrupulous ventures in Chicago were continued in the 20th century by Marshall Field 111 and Henry Field. 95 percent of Marshall Field employees were paid a maximum of 12 dollars a week for at least 60 hours of work in 1912. By now, nearly 50 percent of Field's vast real estate holdings were in New York City and other coastal cities. Lincoln Steffens, the leading expert on the decay of the American city, gave Chicago the dubious distinction of being the worst slum city in the United States-a distinction it earned anew decade after decade under the Fields' urban leadership, a leadership that no mayor of Chicago or governor of Illinois ever dared to defy²³⁵.

Astor's racketeering in New York and Field's in Chicago with urban landed property found their counterpart in state landed property and the greedy owners of the American railroad system²³⁶. The territory of the United States was vastly expanded over a fifty-year period between 1803 and 185^j with minimal effort through: 1) the Louisiana Purchase, 2) the Florida Purchase, 3) the annexation of Texas, 4) the division of Oregon, 5) territorial cessions by Mexico, and 6) the Gadsden Purchase. These acquisitions, along with the original 13 states, encompassed the more than 3 million square miles of the 48 contiguous (out of the total 50) states of today's USA.

Land fraud characterized the American reality from the very beginning and also became the basis for the enormous wealth of the American private railroad companies²³⁷. The fraudulent system was described at the beginning of the railroad era in a Special Report of the Senate Committee on Government Lands of June 20, 1834: The large land companies forcibly kept smaller interested parties out of state land auctions and bribed the Land Office to allot them all valuable land. It was as simple as that²³⁸. As Myers summarizes, the best state lands in the US before the Civil War were sold for \$1.25 per acre "to capitalist speculators"²³⁹. When the railroads began and Congress began granting state lands, the process was no less simple: the railroad magnates simply bribed Congress to give them what they wanted, and once this process proved effective, there were no limits. In 1850, for example, the Illinois Central Railroad was given 2,595,053 acres outright^^ The American railroad era was characterized by swindles and crime from beginning to end^^

Enormous land grabs took place during the post-1850 generation, but as Myers says, "however vast the extent of national wealth that had already been squandered by 1876, there was still more left to seize."²^ Thus the Union Pacific was simply given 13 million acres, the Central Pacific received 9 million acres, the Southern Pacific 18 million - and the Northern Pacific, a true scourge of the Pacific Northwest after the 1870s, took the cake in this group with 47 million acres. Combined, this was a gift of 87 million acres to these four railroads. More than fifty railroad companies received huge grants of land and money from the U.S. Congress with the cooperation of the White House and the Supreme Court²⁴³.

The Coal Land Act purposely gave the railroads control of the known coal deposits on state lands, and now-as Myers put it-"the oligarchy of wealth was triumphantly and voraciously in power."^{24\} Myers was also a sure prophet of things to come: "The theft of state lands has continued, without interruption to the present time, and will undoubtedly continue until every available acre is spoken for."²⁴⁵ In 1917, when Myers made these observations, railroads were no longer the primary beneficiaries of this land theft, but railroad owner gangs were "from about ...1845 to 1890 ...the most powerful among the ruling classes

in the United States. "246 Myers reflected on the unremitting socioeconomic injustice of the American system under the aegis of its plutocratic oligarchy: "Since the government was in reality a regime of property-what then was the condition of the millions of the dispossessed? The full-throated principles of the Declaration of Independence read well, but they were not intended to be applied to the laborer. "247^ On the contrary, the American system was de facto based on the proposition that the possession of money, however it might have come about, was the key to salvation. Hard work and decency, however, were never values of importance to the plutocratic oligarchs who ruled after the United States declared independence in 1776.

State violence against workers

It goes without saying that the Founding Fathers believed in the law of money, since their sole intention when they pushed through their centralized regime in 1789 was to ensure the profit of their speculative investments by means of direct military force - at the expense of the average American citizen. Myers correctly asserted that the hated, foreign English common law was introduced as fundamental law in the USA, against the opposition of liberal-minded personalities such as Patrick Henry and Sam Adams, simply so that American plutocrats of the caliber of Franklin, Washington, Adams, Jefferson and Madison would be able to place property above human life²⁴⁸. Myers' assessment of the influence of this depravity on the vast majority of American professional historians, the so-called court historians, was also correct: "Historical science has hitherto been primarily an institution for the propagation of lies²⁴⁹ "" This was true when Myers wrote it down in 1917, and it was no less true in the later 20th century, when the methods used in the USA to suppress the truth ran the gamut from character assassination to professional discrimination and financial stalking to physical murder²⁵⁰.

Myers recalled that in the United States "in 1825 an agitation arose in favor of a ten-hour working day," but that the capitalists "expended a very considerable sum of money...to suppress the ten-hour movement. "251 The average American factory working day in the 1820s and 1830s was 14 hours, and "employers complained of the audacity of the workers to form unions to obtain a reduction in working hours. "252 2s3.

Working conditions in eastern factories and farms deteriorated before the Civil War, and the Pennsylvania and New York state militia were used extensively to shoot and kill striking workers²⁵⁴. Going west and taking virgin land under the plow required seed money, and "as a rule, migrating farmers found many of the best pieces of land already owned by railroads and large cattle^{er} n. "255 Most of these migrating farmers ended up as landless^{la} ndustrial laborers²⁵⁶. Settlers were generally excluded from large tracts of state

land²⁵⁷ Forgery, perjury, and fraudulent surveys were used extensively by plutocrats to discourage settlers²⁵⁸.

Farmland is sold off to the rich

The original area of federal land (excluding Alaska, Hawaii and the Philippines) was 1,815,504,147 acres²⁵⁹. Of this, approximately 50 million acres of forest land were converted to forest reserves and leased to selected plutocrats for exploitation²⁶⁰. As early as 1880, over one million of the large farms were operated by common farm laborers for wealthy absentee owners- and the total number of working farms in the United States never exceeded four million. In 1880, there were 3323876 migrant farm workers. At that time, only a few of them were Mexican (the total Mexican population of California in 1900 was only 8000!). Most of those American farms that were operated by their owners were too small. The farms above 500 acres, on the other hand, were "predominantly owned by capitalists and operated by laborers." ²⁶¹

Homestead rights to state lands were granted by the Lincoln regime during the Civil War to the masses who had been called upon to die for the plutocracy, but the really valuable lands were turned over to special interests by the same regime and its successors. A strange spectacle occurred after 1900, when "hundreds of thousands of American farmers migrated to the virgin lands of northwestern Canada and settled there." ²⁶² Thus, on the one hand, the vast United States, with its immense tracts of land, was owned or held vacant by special interests, while on the other hand, the land-hungry American farmer had to go abroad to farm^{26J}.

Much of the American livestock industry before the First World War was owned by rich English speculators. The entire US agricultural system was organized to favor the large estates of the wealthy, and in New York State alone there were no fewer than 22,000 abandoned small farms in 1910²⁶⁴. As Myers put it: the USA after 1776 "gave kingdoms of state land to the few while dispossessing the tens of millions" ²⁶⁵.

"What do I care about the law!"

Cornelius Vanderbilt - worth 105 million dollars at his death in 1877 - was the first of many to possess a huge railroad fortune, and during the last 15 years of his life alone he took possession of more than 90 million dollars²⁶⁶. As was the nature of the US plutocratic oligarchy, the uncouth and uneducated (self-proclaimed) Commodore Vanderbilt became the most powerful man in America

in his later years, not unlike the uncouth and uneducated Rockefeller (1839-1937) was after Vanderbilt's death²⁶⁷.

At the time of Vanderbilt's death, the population of the USA was around 50 million, slightly larger than that of Germany or France. Of the 10 million American wage laborers, more than 1/2 million were children working full-time. Not even the "best-paid skilled workers" got anything like \$100 a month, and \$30 a month was already more than the average wage. Few of the 71/2 million in agriculture were doing well, and the majority of so-called independent farmers - who claimed to own their farms - were in fact heavily in debt²⁶⁸.

Vanderbilt made himself immortal by the infamy of his remark to a journalist who had criticized his policy of bribing New York legislators: "What do I care about the law! Don't I have the power?" Myers compared the ordinary Americans with the Commodore: "How immeasurably tiny they all were next to Vanderbilt!"²⁶⁹

Vanderbilt often raised the freight rates of his railroads so that food supplies from the countryside spoiled, farmers earned nothing and the urban population went hungry. He often ruined thousands on a whim²⁷⁰. In 1895, when a Vanderbilt girl married the Duke of Marlborough - a relative of Winston Churchill - the dowry of 10 million dollars was not considered excessive. Despite such generosity, the Vanderbilt fortune had climbed to over 700 million²⁷¹ by 1910. These and similar facts put Myers' description of the comparable lifestyles of the other American railroad barons into perspective²⁷². In each case, there was great respect for wealth, but no respect at all for the law or for human rights. It was the same depraved America that first expected and later loudly demanded that other countries follow its crooked ways and model their institutions after its corrupt example. The messianic euphoria of all US presidents since the sordid end of the Civil War gave the world an example of the impudence of a lagging colonial people, mixed from all races, woefully ignorant of the lessons of history and the arts of true civilization.

Third chapter

LA FOLLETTE'S ATTEMPT TO CLEAN UP THE AUGUST USA

One man and one chance

A corrupt and decadent post-colonial society in transition from predominantly rural to urban conditions, as was 19th century America after the unfortunate end of the stupid and unnecessary Civil War, can only be helped - if it can be helped at all - by a great leader who appears like a miracle in the hour of greatest need: this is the only lesson that history has to offer the present on an empirical basis. All other rules and lessons from the past are theological speculation. This hero in the hour of need is never perfect, because mere human beings have never been perfect, but he represents the best his race has to offer, and his eventual success or failure will depend less on his own performance than on whether the society he is willing to help still has enough good qualities at its core amidst the prevailing evil to make redemption possible.

For many years after "Fighting Bob" LaFollette began his political career in the 1880s, it looked as if the USA would pass the test, but the triumph of evil in 1912 wiped out that chance forever - at least as far as this one nation, the old USA of 1789, was concerned. Perhaps some did not realize it at the time, but the sordid events of the First and Second World Wars made many people realize that the old USA as such, the political society based on the flawed and corrupt Constitution of 1787, had passed the point of no return, beyond which redemption was no longer possible. The future of the people and the country of the old USA will depend solely on whether an experiment that has clearly failed is abandoned and a fresh start is made. Any other alternative will only perpetuate permanent chaos.

LaFollette² richly deserved the popularity and respect he enjoyed. Not only was he a tireless worker of baroque virtuosity, but he saw correctly on all matters of importance and remains the only American of all time of whom that can honestly be said. Any mediocre historian who holds this view can win any debate with a dissenting historian, however brilliant he may be. Thelen³ set

himself the task of both explaining the American Progressive movement - which he did not do overly well - and, and he did so very successfully and with scrupulous accuracy, describing the details of LaFollette's career. Of course, without building on a work like Myers's⁴, the Progressive movement itself cannot be explained effectively. Thelen correctly notes that Progressivism began in the 1890s as an American insurrectionary movement that came from the people at large, but his explanation of what the rebellion was directed against is far too abstract: LaFollette wanted to "unthrow the power of the associations over the government." ⁵ It is true: Had the American corporations been at least partially decent and honorable, LaFollette might have been willing to join Sorel, Lagardelle, and Mussolini in favor of a corporate state, but what Thelen forgot to point out was that the corporations of the United States were the most corrupt in the world, mere playthings in the hands of villains of great wealth like Astor, Vanderbilt, Field, Rockefeller, and Morgan.

Any government under the control of such heinous wrongdoers as that of the USA had to be the most depraved in the world, and its citizens the most victimized. They were literally paupers in a land of plenty. All this is missing from Thelen, as if Bob LaFollette and progressivism moved in a vacuum. There is another point Thelen has not adequately considered: "Fighting Bob" LaFollette alone was 90 percent of progressivism (clearly understood by his local leaders like George Record in New Jersey, Jonathan Dolliver in Iowa, and Hiram Johnson in California), and progressivism as a real movement - there was no middle ground - lived and died with Fighting Bob.

The youthful years of an American tribune

Bob LaFollette was born on June 14, 1855 into a westward-migrating family. His ethnic heritage was French, German, Scottish and English. The family had been in the wilderness of Primrose Township, Wisconsin, since 1850 and had operated one of the best farms in the area⁶. Bob's father died in 1856, eight months after Bob's birth⁷. Thus his mother Mary LaFollette lost her second husband and this time had four children to support. In 1862, when Bob was seven years old, she married John Saxton, a village grocer. Bob now moved from the country to the city for eight years, until he was old enough to manage his father's farm in 1870. He took Mary and her financially unsuccessful third husband to the farm. At this time Bob, who was fluent in English, French and German, also learned Norwegian so that he could converse fluently with his Norwegian neighbors. The following facts speak against the assumption that Bob, like most young Americans, was overly influenced by the older generation: 1. like many people in Wisconsin from the older generation, Bob's mother and stepfather were Democrats because they were against the crazy warmongering tactics of Lincoln's Black Republicans⁸ - but this problem no

longer affected the 1870s, and so Bob became a Republican. 2 Mary and John Saxton were religiously strict Calvinist Baptists - but Bob became a free-thinking agnostic in the 1870s. He later moved in the direction of non-denominational positive Christianity rather than atheism.⁹ Intellectual independence and self-assurance characterized Bob throughout his life: He had an open, inquiring mind, free of all prejudices-ethnic or otherwise-but far from making him tolerate everything bad about the vogue of modern liberalism, his creative gifts made it possible for him to use his free will and conscience to choose quickly and confidently between good and evil. Bob was also extremely practical: from the age of fifteen he proved to country people all around that he was, like his late father, a good dairy farmer.

Unlike most of their neighbors, Bob and his parents were in complete agreement on one point: the benefits of schooling. Bob had a good mind, and the three of them agreed that he should continue his education without restriction. Bob had started elementary school at the age of four, and in the late 1860s Mary sold parts of his late father's farm so that he could attend good private schools. Mary's third husband died in 1872 when Bob was seventeen. Bob's older brother had long since succumbed to the general wanderlust and moved farther west-very little was heard of him. The great American economic crisis after the Civil War, which spread to Europe, began in 1873, bringing an end in Germany to those legendary years after the unification of the country (1871) that became known as the founding years (because of the many new business ventures and inventions of that period). The American market for land products was poor after the overexpansion of the Civil War, and Saxton's bumbling mercantile business had long since fallen into disarray. Bob decided to rely on his own ability and persuaded his mother and older sister Josephine to accompany him to Madison, Wisconsin. Three years of farm work had interrupted his schooling, and he had to complete two years of preparatory school before he could enroll at the University of Wisconsin in 1875.

All this might seem rather unimportant today, more than a century later, but in 1875 there were only 27,000 college students in the entire United States, and the proportion of those from the western frontier was very small. Years of study were financed by Bob selling the books of reputable publishers and teaching part-time at the preparatory school, and by Mary and Josephine boarding students. In addition, as a gregarious student in Madison, Bob quickly realized that there was no student newspaper, so he edited and published one himself from 1876 to 1879, earning an average of \$700 annually.

In addition to all his work and study, Bob also led quite an active social life, earning a reputation as campus chiefprankster¹⁰ (like a court jester who is his own carnival prince year-round) through his zest for life and robust sense of humor. Some of the more sedate members of the Madison faculty took an active

dislike to a youthful man of intellectual independence and early maturity of mind, but Bob's Bachelor of Arts degree (1879) was never in doubt, for he always enjoyed the personal encouragement of John Bascom, Madison's able humanist scholar who was president of the University of Wisconsin.

Bob received, among other honors at graduation, the top prize in the competition for best orator out of 10,000 college students from all over the American Midwest (including Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Kansas, Nebraska and Missouri). He was also the male star in all of the university's 1875-1879 plays^

Among his classmates who greatly admired him was Bob's future beautiful wife, Belle Case. She was born in 1860 and was the first woman to graduate from the University of Wisconsin Law School. Bob and Belle became engaged in 1878 while both were still students. Highly intelligent and fiercely independent, Belle was as healthy and strong as she was poised and beautiful. Both Bob and Belle were powerfully dynamic personalities and of excellent breed. One cannot help but notice the difference between this wonderful couple, whose four children all became prominent (Bob Jr. as U.S. Senator, Phil as General MacArthur's chief aide in Japan, the two girls as scientists), and the sordid and despicable private lives and family relationships of Teddy Roosevelt, Woody Wilson and Frank Roosevelt.

The fiancés had enough common sense not to think about marriage until Bob was professionally established. Belle taught preparatory school after graduation, while Bob crammed his way through law school in a record six months. He successfully passed the Wisconsin bar exam in February 1880 and at the age of 24 - after previous success as a farmer, writer, orator, linguist, editor and university student - became a full-fledged American lawyer. The faith he had in himself when he risked going to Madison with his dependent relatives in 1873 was fully and brilliantly justified.

First political successes; US domestic policy in the eighties

His next step was a major campaign to win election as District Attorney of Dane County (where Madison was located). When the local Republican boss told him he could not run for the office without buying the endorsement of the fraudulent plutocratic kingpin oligarch Philetus Sawyer,¹² Bob gave the Goethean Götz von Berlichingen response. Despite the fanatical opposition of his own party machine, Bob won the November 1880 election by working hard on the individual voter and won re-election two years later with ease. After his 1880 election victory, Bob and Belle married

Bob's lifelong worldview was formed before he decided to run for an even

higher office in 1884. True, he remained a Republican in that Union election year, in which the mayor of Buffalo, New York, Grover Cleveland, won the presidency as a Democrat. But Bob realized that up and down the country both the Republican and Democratic parties had fallen into the hands of the same plutocratic gang, that the American two-party system was a perverse farce in the absence of real differences between the only two powerful parties, and that the United States was in fact a one-party dictatorship under the rule of the plutocratic oligarchy.

It would have been relatively easy for Bob to join the victors. He was good-looking and extroverted, and had no radical preconceptions of the kind that plagued Marx, Trotsky, Lenin or Stalin. Wisconsin quickly became a popular state and thus - because of the neck-and-neck race between Democrats and Republicans - like Ohio, an ideal "house power" for a presidential candidate who could make the difference. No one in American politics from 1884 to the present came close to Bob in intellectual stature, manpower and strategic aptitude. Ergo: The presidency would have been effortless for him - long before his 1912 bid as a reformer - just by playing it safe from within in the style of Teddy Roosevelt, Woody Wilson and Frank Roosevelt. He wouldn't have needed the wild back-and-forth party switching that tainted Winston Churchill's selfish and opportunistic political career. Bob knew the rules of the game and with his never-failing shrewdness could have become the best political tactician¹⁴ the US has ever seen. Earlier men like Washington, Jefferson or Lincoln were political infants compared to him. He also knew something that none of the aforementioned leaders would have thought worth considering: Those who sell their conscience once may do so forever. The second quality that made LaFollette unique in US political history, apart from his extraordinary talent, was his honesty. This honesty also gave rise to his lifelong political slogan: Better nothing than half measures^{14a}.

Consider the typical American political situation of 1884, when Bob LaFollette decided to pursue a career in OS federal politics. The Republican presidential candidate, the dandyish James G. Blaine of Maine, was an admitted thief who had taken bribes from the international Jewish credit Mobilier as a member of the OS Congress, and the Democratic candidate, the physically massive Grover Cleveland of New York, was a bachelor of disgraceful moral turpitude who had disposed of one of his mistresses by locking her up forever in a prison-like insane asylum, and disposed of an illegitimate son by putting him in a wretched orphanage a la Oliver Twist. E. L. Godkin, the British-born editor of the New York magazine Nation, solved the dilemma by advising Americans to send Blaine into private life, where he led an exemplary family life, and to provide Cleveland with enough work in the White House so that he would have little time to sin - but Godkin was heartbroken at the corruption everywhere. The

USA was - to use an expression by the English poet laureate William Wordsworth - a "marsh full of foul water".

There was no prospect of improvement in 1884. In 1872, the leading German-American politician Carl Schurz had persuaded the pugnacious newspaper man Horace Greeley to run for the presidency against the drunkard General Grant, but Greeley fared badly and lost his newspaper, the New York Tribune, in the course of his campaign and died soon afterwards¹⁵. This was the sad fate of the great reformer Horace Greeley, who wanted to bring clean men into high office-although he himself was never quite as flawless as LaFollette, for example-but who had to discover that even a partially decent man was an abomination to the ruling plutocratic oligarchy. ^{ee}The kind of perfection this oligarchy sought in its political stooges was made clear to the Democratic presidential candidate Tilden in 1876 by August Belmont, the Jewish Rothschild agent and Democratic Party leader since 1861^{Vor} : "We need men in^{Amt.} who don't steal - but who also don't mind if others do!"¹⁶

Wisconsin's German population grew rapidly during Bob's lifetime. ^{The} Germans were the largest ethnic group in the state in 1884, and a^{FLo}llette was bound to them by ancestry and knowledge of the language, also by the fact that they possessed more personal decency than any other ethnic group in the United States. That's why they valued the same quality in Bob. Despite Boss Sawyer's opposition, he won both the nomination and election to the U.S. Congress in 1884[^]

LaFollette in Congress: Beginning of the fight against the corrupt oligarchy

Bob was the youngest member of Congress at the age of 29. Washington/D.C. was then, as now, a dirty city with slums and an oppressively humid climate. After clean and lovely Madison, Wisconsin, on the wooded shore and serene blue waters of Lake Mendota, Bob was strongly averse to life in Washington. Few Americans at the time subscribed to the Congressional Record - in stark contrast to the widely read Congressional Globe before the Civil War. Lincoln's corrupt and arbitrary abuse of power during this senseless butchery had destroyed the average American's interest in politics, and voter turnout in federal elections dropped from 88 percent before the war to an average of 35 percent in the decades afterward. Thad Stevens, no paragon of cleanliness himself, once told Lincoln that his Secretary of War, Cameron, was such a crook that he would steal anything except a red-hot stove. When Lincoln demanded an apology, Stevens improved: Cameron would actually steal even the hot stove. Revulsion against the murky swamp of American politics manifested itself in

the indifference of the electorate.

LaFollette wanted to revitalize the American people's interest in federal politics, and as a first step, he and Belle decided to duplicate at their own expense all of his speeches, along with those of his debate opponents, and mail them to all Wisconsin voters. To finance this heroic program, the two had to live in cheap boarding houses during their first years in Washington.

Bob successfully built his own political organization to secure his re-election in 1886 and 1888, and he also persuaded Tom Reed, the Speaker of the House, to support his nomination to various committees: the all-powerful Ways and Means Committee as well as an unusually large number of smaller committees dealing with a wide range of socio-economic and political issues. Many members of the House of Representatives and virtually all Senators quickly became specialized lobbyists for one or two of the corrupt special interests, be it railroads, steel, transportation, sugar, domestic watchmaking, and the like. Bob LaFollette, on the other hand, saw his congressional affiliation as a two-way communication between himself and each of his constituents, with a duty to represent their views on all issues with expertise and reasonableness. This expertise was the most important thing, and in order to acquire it and obtain all confidential information, one had to participate in the relevant committees.

While most of his colleagues indulged in idleness, spent much of their time in whorehouses and drinking bouts, and barely bothered to stay awake during legislative deliberations, Bob worked hard and became knowledgeable. The few other legislators who worked as hard as he did were not exaggerating when they described him as the smartest man ever to sit in the U.S. Congress, and needless to say, no congressman after Bob's death in 1925 has equaled his knowledge, much less his accomplishments. Among other things, Bob always championed human rights and in 1886 accepted an invitation to deliver the commencement address to the graduates of the Howard Negro University Academy of Law¹⁹.

LaFollette agreed with the conservative Negro leader Booker T. Washington that, having gained some political advantages between 1865 and 1868 through Constitutional Amendments Numbers 13 through 15, it should be incumbent upon the Negro to work hard and acquire skills so that one day Negroes within American society could also assume their due share of the burdens of citizenship. Abe Lincoln, on the other hand, had endeavored until just before his assassination in 1865 to prepare for the deportation of all Negroes in the United States to South America and Africa, in the cynical conviction - which he harbored throughout his life - that the intellectual inferiority of Negroes, together with their proverbial laziness and licentiousness, forever precluded their ever becoming satisfactory U.S. citizens.

In 1880-not yet a generation after the de jure end of American slavery-it was too soon to foresee how this question would actually develop, and it must be

fairly admitted a century later that events confirmed Lincoln's expectations rather than the hopes of LaFollette or B. T. Washington. Be that as it may, had the United States in 1912, under LaFollette's leadership, taken a turn toward honesty and decency, the role of the Negro in U.S. society could easily have been quite different.

Ethnic tolerance within the pluralistic United States was characteristic of Bob, but the centerpiece of his radical reform program for the United States-historically known as American Progressivism-was equal economic opportunity based on fair competition, along with a clean political system and a government that represented all citizens of the country and no longer just the money power of the ruling plutocratic oligarchy. Bob was a political and socio-economic victor in an uncompromising battle against the Alberich-Mammon dragon of anti-democratic plutocracy^{20^}

He agreed with Professor W. G. Sumner of Yale University, the doyen of American economics, that for all the alleged glories of international free competition, the United States needed a period of artificial protection in the form of protective tariffs in order to develop its domestic industry optimally on the basis of its enormous natural resources - all the more so because, unlike England, France or Germany, the United States was a debtor nation with foreign investment at home far exceeding American investment abroad. LaFollette's stance on the tariff issue was significant not only because of his membership on congressional committees, but also because President Cleveland made tariff reduction the only major issue in his unsuccessful 1888 re-election campaign. The British government carelessly backed Cleveland against his Republican rival from Indiana, the diminutive, mousy Benjamin Harrison, and the American public's hatred of England was so great at the time that the "English question"-not the actual tariff issue-cost the Democrat the presidency his re-election.

Bob responded to the public's lack of guidance on the vital tariff issue by working hard to assemble arguments in favor of the protective tariff - and many of them were German in origin, stemming from Bismarck's successful protective tariff policy after 1879 in Hohenzollern Germany and the work of German neo-mercantilists, led by Gustav von Schmoller (1838-1917).

It was sheer hypocrisy on the part of English Tories and Liberals alike to declare that the United States and Germany were in reactionary opposition to the worldwide British free trade system, and above all it was pure claptrap to claim that the English free trade policy-which had only been in force since 1849-was a sacred principle for England and served the better understanding of nations. Forty-three years after the American tariff dispute of 1888, the English very quickly abandoned their free trade in favour of their own protective tariff system, no sooner had they realized that this was in their national interest^{2^}.

Although Bob agreed with W. G. Sumner that the United States needed some temporary protection against the full force of foreign - especially British - industrial competition, he parted company with Sumner on the most important domestic economic issue facing American politicians: How could reins be put on the greedy rich malefactors, the scoundrels of the Astor, Vanderbilt and Rockefeller ilk? Sumner contented himself with a platonic reliance on the American criminal justice system, notoriously corrupt as it was, to rein in excesses, and he argued that sweeping federal intervention would curtail freedom: A and B put their heads together and determine what C has to do for D - and Sumner called C the "forgotten man" (for whom nothing comes of it). Forty years later, FDR twisted Sumner's concept into its opposite - just as Marx had twisted Rule - by claiming that D, not C, was the forgotten man - and this at a time when legislation in favor of D already exceeded a hundredfold anything Sumner had thought possible in his worst premonitions. LaFollette, however, claimed that Sumner's softness toward the rich wrongdoers meant nothing more than justifying the murder of the competitive system that Sumner supposedly cherished, but which had never had a chance of survival in the US precisely because of the excesses of these wrongdoers. Therefore, they had to be brought to heel²²

Bob fought an uphill battle in favor of the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887 - which, in theory, would enable federal officials to curb the excesses of wrongdoers in obstructing domestic commerce - and the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890, which would allow federal officials to break up giant financial and industrial corporations that hindered competition, to break up gigantic financial and industrial corporations that hindered competition - the trouble was that such important legislation would forever remain merely on paper unless the government departed from its English model and became decent. Decency was still not a trait of American government at the federal level, even if a few small New England municipalities traditionally professed it. Government lawyers were still poorly paid compared to the private attorneys of wrongdoers, and it was not difficult for the latter to bribe or even hire the former - it happened every day. The introduction of decent governance was needed to rein in these corrupt lawyers in government service and put them in jail or otherwise punish them for selling out the people to the malefactors of great wealth.

LaFollette realized that in 1890 Congress had laid a good theoretical basis for curbing the evildoers. The time had come to strike an effective blow in favor of a decent administration and to put all the Platonic advances into practice. Until then, nothing had happened in this direction. The Populists, that great radical American movement of 1890, were too naive to tackle these problems effectively. They looked for simple solutions along the lines of the soft money platform advocated for them in 1896 by William J. Bryan, the first radical

Democratic presidential candidate since the Civil War. Men like James Weaver and Ignatius Donnelly, the leaders of the Populists, and Bryan himself, the leading Populist figure in the Democratic Party, lacked the ability and even the knowledge to eradicate American public and private economic corruption - even if they had won all federal political offices. They would have just kept playing with easy solutions until the impatient voters chased them out of office again - and the wrongdoers would have remained in their comfortable and profitable role of the laughing third party.

Bob LaFollette showed during his three terms in the House of Representatives what he was capable of as an honorable and hard-working parliamentarian. He made valuable suggestions for improving the legislative process - so many that they cannot be reproduced here - and they were eagerly taken up by throngs of his colleagues. But all this was not enough for him: he had yet to show in practice what he was capable of accomplishing as a decent man in the administration, and to demonstrate to the American people how much each individual could gain from clean politics. Bob realized, however, that it would have been unfair to the decent people of Wisconsin - who had elected him to Congress three times - to go straight into the federal administration while that unfortunate Wisconsin remained firmly in the grubby hands of Boss Philetus Sawyer and his aides. First he had to clean up Wisconsin - and it would take a decade or more of the precious time of this most knowledgeable of all U.S. federal legislators. At the age of 35, his embassy was finalized, and he and Belle returned to Madison, Wisconsin, with their children^^

The "cleansing" of the state of Wisconsin

Thelen, for reasons unknown, does not judge favorably Bob's activities after the end of his third congressional term in 1891, claiming that Bob's 1911 autobiography exaggerated some aspects of the early steps. Admittedly, Bob had become Wisconsin's top courtroom lawyer overnight, but regrettably suffered from nervous exhaustion repeatedly in the 1890s - a sign that he had worked too hard for his personal prosperity². Much like Sam Adams, the Massachusetts hero who pushed through the independence platform of 1770, Bob and Belle had indulged too much in socializing: they enjoyed entertaining friends and relatives in both their country and city homes. Thelen also claims that the two "always needed money", but admits that they never had debts thanks to Bob's successful law practice. The facts in Thelen's criticism of the LaFollette family during the 1890s are accurate, except that the real reason for the unmistakable dislike of Bob and Belle remains obscure²⁵. One thing is certain: In 1900, Bob LaFollette emerged victorious as the reform governor of

Wisconsin, and the corrupt Sawyer party machine that had strangled, suckered, and exhausted the state for 35 years was crushed and vanquished forever.

One-fifth of Wisconsin's banks went bankrupt during the first year of the American Depression of 1893 alone. Bob had considered 1892 and 1894 too early to seek the Republican gubernatorial nomination in the face of opposition from the united Democratic opposition and the Republican Sawyer machine. In 1896, however, largely because of the economic difficulties and suffering of the people of Wisconsin, he fought hard for this nomination. When Sawyer won that first battle, Bob's reaction was typical: instead of moderating, he came out with an even more radical program in 1897. His earnest radicalism brought him victory three years later, notwithstanding the fact that the blood-stained profits from the otherwise senseless and unquestionably criminal war of aggression waged by the United States against Spain (1898) had by then eliminated the economic crisis.

So it was not in stormy weather, as in 1896, when an economic emergency could be exploited politically, but in fair economic weather that LaFollette destroyed Sawyer's "machine" in 1900. It was a great and heroic battle, and if Bob's entire career had consisted solely of this one victorious feat, his place in the political Valhalla of the USA would have been secured forever. And not only because of the blessing it brought to the decent people of Wisconsin: Bob also made political inventions and introduced important new tactics. He showed that what a handful of reform mayors had accomplished in their cities could be accomplished at the state level, and it has been accurately said that LaFollette's victory in Wisconsin was followed by Hiram Johnson's victory in California, and similar victories in Iowa, Nebraska, and elsewhere.

Soparadox it may seem, but returning home to Wisconsin and winning the toughest battle of his life at the state level made it possible for Bob to rally a movement at the federal level through the power of his personal image: in 1900, progressivism replaced populism once and for all as the leading American popular movement of discontent directed against the criminal overreaches of Morgan and Rocketteller in particular and against the ruling plutocratic oligarchs in general. The fundamental flaw in Thelen's investigation is the same as in many other pseudo-scientific reports: He failed to note, analyze, and explain the squalid and adverse socioeconomic and political environment in which LaFollette had to win his victories, and the new and viable path to the American future he opened up. Bob was the first and last to offer the average American real hope instead of cheap, empty, inflated ideals² 6.

The appeal to the people of the USA

Bob had hammered home to Americans during the 1890s the contrast between rich and poor in their country: like Poland, but unlike Germany and

France, there was no center of gravity somewhere in the middle in the US: People were either very rich or very poor. It has often been argued that LaFollette's progressivism after 1890, like Hitler's National Socialism in Germany after 1919, drew its strongest support from the so-called lower middle class, but what was undoubtedly true in Hitler's case was not necessarily true in Bob's case. Rather, his aim was to create such a class in the first place, one that was aware of its destiny. The American miscreants from George Washington and Thomas Jefferson to J. D. Rockefeller and J. P. Morgan had refused to allow such a class to emerge. These malefactors and, in the case of Washington and Jefferson, God-fearing impostors desired lowly subjects who were easy to manipulate. A proud and self-confident American lower middle class would have thwarted many of their successful plutocratic conspiracies²⁷.

Bob gave guest lectures at the University of Chicago during the 1890s. His epoch-making speech there in February 1897 contrasted sharply with FDR's infamous, deceptive Chicago speech forty years later in October 1937. Bob advocated the immediate adoption by all states of the system of direct primaries for the presidential nomination-a system whose chief theorist was Henry U'ren of Oregon. The American way of selecting presidential candidates had become hopelessly corrupt since the tumultuous presidential campaign of 1840 (-Tippecanoe and Tyler too") as a result of the outdated convention system²⁸. American party conventions were and are something like shows in a madhouse. Every US citizen and foreign observer would have to attend at least one of them to realize that for themselves. Most memorable in my own memory was the 1964 Republican convention, at which I was able to move about freely, -since I had a press pass. Most of the attendees and delegates screeched and stammered like madmen, while the important decisions were made in secret in smoke-filled rooms behind closed^s doors.

LaFollette was one of the few people who recognized that the US was still a primitive, uncivilized and culturally almost totally underdeveloped country, but he hoped that an increase in educational institutions would help uplift the downtrodden US citizenry and make it possible for them to become less passive and more active and mature. In short, Bob hoped to mobilize the intelligence potential of the U.S. - believing that the mass of citizens were not born fools, as their plutocratic masters conveniently assumed. Bob knew that a general and uniform popular education system could enable Americans to elect honest and clean men to their presidencies and not always rogues and criminals. Each individual state could ensure that its convention delegates represented what J. J. Rousseau had called the General Will in the 18th century.

One root of the obel: the corrupt electoral system

Until now, there had been no sign of this general will in the USA. Every American political science graduate knows that in the 1787-1789 ratification controversy over the second U.S. Constitution, the vast majority of those who were allowed to vote opposed its adoption, but that shameless manipulation and vote tampering nonetheless brought about the adoption desired by the plutocrats. Lincoln's 14th Amendment to the same Constitution was a bizarre product of Civil War hysteria, but nonetheless became the most cited constitutional provision in the strange post-1937 Supreme Court decisions during the New Deal. This dubious Constitutional Amendment Number 14 was formally proclaimed as adopted three years after Lincoln's assassination during a period of martial law, but in reality it has not yet been adopted in a lawful manner, either by the American electorate as a whole or by the individual states. Bob LaFollette longed for an end to such hopeless depravity. He believed - and rightly so in the judgment of later pundits - that a similar and universal system of direct primaries would clear the way for decency, at least for an expression of the will of the people in filling the presidency.

This new system was quickly adopted by Wisconsin and a number of other states and was halfway to being fully implemented.

Realization when LaFollette was stabbed in the back in 1912 by the corrupt, reactionary warmonger Teddy Roosevelt, who promised to support Bob for the presidency but never kept that promise. Although Teddy had solemnly vowed to the American people that he would never run again, he secretly worked against Bob until the last minute and then announced his own candidacy. Bob was strong enough to prevent Teddy's election, but the split in the Republican Party made it possible for the degenerate and mentally disturbed Woody Wilson to get into the White House.

Unsurprisingly, Wilson's presidency paralyzed the development of Bob's primary election system, which had been adopted by nearly a third of US states by 1912. The system is still only fragmentarily realized today, and the decrepit party conventions still exist. The enormity of the choice of Wilson over LaFollette is underscored by what Wilson said publicly in 1885 against the American system of separation of powers and in favor of oligarchic English cabinet government²⁹ He never recanted it later. Edward Mandel House, Wilson's first advisor until he was replaced by Bernard Baruch in 1917 (both were Jews from the South), had a book published in New York in 1912, "Philip Dru, Administrator", which advocated American military aggression in Europe and a compulsory League of Nations on the principles that the Basel Zionist Congress had proposed in 1897 and which were then to be adopted in Geneva in 1920. Although Bryan later declared that his hair stood on end when he read this

book, he was cunningly dissuaded by its author at the 1912 Democratic Convention in Baltimore from supporting Champ Clark, the leading Democratic reformer who would not have kept the US out of the First World War had he been elected.

Wilson knew how unscrupulously Clark had been slandered by House and would never have been allowed to accept a nomination under such circumstances had he been a man of honor.^{mc} Despite the crookedness of Teddy Roosevelt and Woody Wilson, however, LaFollette would not have been^{dr} ousted in 1912 had the United States had the universal primary election system that Bob had advocated fifteen years earlier in his great Chicago speech.

^{Doch} back to 1900, Philetus Sawyer died during LaFollette's gubernatorial campaign³⁰, but his corrupt disciples continued the fight against Bob³⁰^ Not surprisingly, the Republican plutocrats now poured money and support into Bob's Democratic rival Louis Bornrieb for his nomination, and large sums were spent from New York and Chicago on ads and publicity for Bomrich. Bob - a tireless campaigner in times of crisis - traveled ' 6433 miles and gave 208 speeches to more than 200,000 voters during the last three weeks of his 1900 campaign alone, garnering 60 percent of the vote and winning 64 of Wisconsin's 70 counties.

Thousands of happy Wisconsinans crowded into the University of Wisconsin Sports Arena for Bob's Inaugural Ball on January 7, 1901. His mother had died, but Belle, his beautiful wife, was only forty³¹^ Bob was in poor physical condition in early 1901 due to exhaustion (he had lost forty pounds and had to be nursed back to health), which earned him stern criticism from Thelen that he should have learned to take better care of himself long ago³²^

As Myers pointed out³³, railroads were favored instruments of exploitation by American plutocrats after the Civil War. In 1903, however, thanks to LaFollette's tireless struggle, Wisconsin became the first state in which railroads were safely subject to state socialist control. The corresponding legislative program of neighboring Illinois had been brought down a generation earlier by corrupt lawyers, but they were no match for Bob LaFollette, no matter how incessantly they tried to smear and belittle him. One thinks of Pliny's remark on hearing that the Roman Academy of Law in Taranto had been destroyed by an earthquake: "Another nest of vipers has been destroyed! "

Teacher of a nation of ignorant people

In the USA, in those final years before the advent of audiovisual mass media, there was no better opportunity for an ambitious politician to reach the masses across the USA than the Chau- tauqua Lectures, named after the town in upstate New York where this lecture cycle had begun. It was mainly due to his

sensational success as a great Chautauqua speaker that W. J. Bryan was able to maintain the leadership of the Democratic Party for twenty years despite the defeats he suffered in all three of his presidential bids. He ran on soft money against the gold standard in 1896, against US imperialism in 1900, and on a real anti-trust program in 1908 to replace Teddy Roosevelt's fake one. LaFollette, who had been an award-winning orator throughout the Midwest as a student, became the most popular Chautauqua orator of all time - shortly after he completed the first phase of his socioeconomic and political reform program for Wisconsin as governor³. He won the support of both Wisconsin Republicans and Democrats. He won re-election as governor in 1904 without campaign organization or other expense solely by appealing directly to the voters in his speeches and subsequent informal debates that often lasted all night. He could afford the luxury of scheduling fewer speeches at this time, but he did not do so out of indolence: when necessary, he was always available to answer his constituents' questions throughout the night and help them deal with their problems.

Bob's methods had nothing to do with showing off - even though very few of the extremely hard-drinking American politicians of his generation ever chaired an informal eight- or ten-hour mass meeting. The irritably nervous, overly sexual Woody Wilson would never have made it, and another creature of the plutocrats, Teddy Roosevelt - who scoffed at the so-called muckraking - despised the masses far too much to sit through such a meeting. LaFollette's personal commitment and perseverance stemmed from his own empirical discovery that no problem in the whole tangle of domestic and foreign policy issues confronting the average American was too complicated for him to understand, provided he was honestly and patiently supplied with all the pertinent facts. Moreover, Bob's emphasis on explaining, rather than merely imparting information, was not condescending - quite the opposite: he remembered very well how his own schooling had been delayed by those three years of working 16 hours a day to successfully run a large dairy farm. But no one can do sixteen hours of hard physical labor a day and still find the time to keep up with the political and socio-economic developments of an entire country.

Bob recognized from his own experience that the average American citizen at the beginning of the new century had to work far too hard to deal with the issues facing him on the American political scene. The citizen needed honest enlightenment, and Bob rejected the opinion of the cynics - among them many court historians - that political enlightenment and hypocrisy before the masses were one and the same. No one knew better than LaFollette that the average American had been pumped full of lies for generations. This made starting a conversation with him more difficult than if he had been totally ignorant. The

good teacher first decides the instrumental goals and ultimate purpose of a course of study. Showing off, condescension and flaunting erudition for its own sake have no place in good teaching. Bob LaFollette had been as good a teacher as he was a farmer, as good a speaker and writer as he was a student. So he knew exactly what he had set out to do, without underestimating the difficulty of getting started.

Unlike most people with a good education, Bob was careful not to assume that average people were more knowledgeable than they really were. That's why his conversation with all kinds of people has been so amazingly successful over the years. He believed in their good will and never let the inevitable human foibles upset him. He gave a good example of the latter in his 1911 autobiography, an incident during one of the typical battles against the lobbies of the wealthy malefactors at work in the Wisconsin legislature as in all other states. After a vote unfavorable to him caused a tactical setback on a particular issue, Bob asked one of his previously trusted henchmen in the legislature why he had voted for the wrong side. One of the lobbyists had managed to turn this once dutiful man around, and he now replied with brutal candor - it was not easy to lie to Bob - that he had had to choose between his principles and his sandwich. He had chosen the sandwich. That was human, all too human. Bob, of course, was too much of a man and a leader to forgive immediately, but he also knew that confession or scolding alone was not enough for true atonement - action must follow. So he adopted a wait-and-see attitude. Later, when the one time apostate supported a controversial measure at personal sacrifice, Bob took the prodigal son back into the fold and treated him like those who had not strayed. For him, atonement was only genuine and meaningful if it was equally total for both parties³⁵.

Many an observer wondered why the highbrow Lincoln Steffens³⁶ was the loudest of all the "Muckrakers" not only to approve of LaFollette's policies, but even to praise them to the skies. The reason for this was probably that Steffens had first-hand knowledge of the evil state of American life at the local level. His son Pete Steffens later told me at Harvard that "Fighting Bob" had always been the number one hero in the Steffens family's domestic pantheon.

Progressives claim Wisconsin; Roosevelt's imperialism

Thelen points out with obvious satisfaction that Teddy Roosevelt finished his 1904 presidential race (the only one he won) with 63 percent of the vote (though turnout was low), while LaFollette for the same Republicans got only 51 percent of the vote in his re-election as governor of Wisconsin³⁸ (though turnout was very high). Teddy had won cheap fame in the 1898 war of aggression against

weak Spain without any real accomplishments and had been careful enough afterward to take contradictory positions on domestic issues as long as he completed the term of the assassinated President McKinley. While Teddy had been allowed to go to Cuba in 1898 (from where he immaturely and effusively wrote to a chauvinist Harvard friend, Henry Cabot Lodge, about the joy of seeing dead Spanish soldiers), Bryan - who had been chosen as the Democratic presidential candidate for 1900 - was banished by McKinley with his Nebraska volunteers to the wilds of South Florida, a hundred miles away from the actual war effort. In this way, McKinley avoided the problems of Democratic^{pr} president Polk fifty years earlier: the latter had allowed his rival^{ren} Whig generals to win military honors in the United States' early^{ren} anti-Hispanic crusade, the war against Mexico¹ 846- 184839.

E^s was not a favorable wind for Bryan. He only gained a taste of^s south Florida and then went on to play the leading role in launching^{des} the land boom there that continues today. Old Florida, which fought with its twelve sister states to the South in the Civil War of 1861-1865, had 98 percent of its white settlement in the farmlands of North Florida, bordering Georgia and Alabama; South Florida, on the other hand, was Seminole Indian country in those days.

Bryan's dismal failure against McKinley in 1900 prompted him to run New York judge Alton Parker against Teddy Roosevelt in 1904. Parker, however, proved to be such an unusually weak and incompetent candidate that Bryan himself ran again against Taft in 1908. In the meantime, Bob LaFollette had been doing the opposite of what Teddy was doing: He worked hard for domestic political reform during the years leading up to 1904 - and all the plutocratic sharks poured support and bribes into Wisconsin to defeat him in 1904, which seemed all the easier since he was operating with no slush fund of his own and no professional campaign staff, and no doubt some people were intimidated by Bob's perceived strident radicalism as well, counting his political alliance with the German socialist mayor of Milwaukee, Victor Berger.

Roosevelt's 1904 presidential bid, on the other hand, was lavishly financed by J. P. Morgan and John D. Rockefeller. The only achievement to be mentioned from the completion of McKinley's term was in the foreign policy field and was an international crime comparable to McKinley's April 1898 war message to the US Congress (concealing the fact that Spain had already diplomatically surrendered to the American ambassador in Madrid). Roosevelt then invaded Colombia in 1903 without a declaration of war and conquered the five northwestern provinces of this unfortunate country to form the new US protectorate of Panama^{40^}

There was no excuse for Roosevelt's brutal crimes. He should have been hauled before the Hague tribunal^{4^} So, given the abysmally sordid circumstances of his 1904 presidential run, Thelen's delight at his improved

showing over LaFollette does nothing to enhance the former's political reputation or diminish Bob's. It alone says bad things about Thelen's own sense of values in politics^{42^}

When one of Wisconsin's seats in the US Senate became vacant in late 1905, Bob recommended that the Wisconsin legislature give him the job himself. This was before the ratification of the 17th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution (1913), which was largely due to LaFollette himself and which ended the corrupt 1789-1913 system whereby U.S. Senators were appointed exclusively by state legislatures and not elected by the people. The fact that George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and James Madison were behind this system speaks for itself; the power of the Senate was many times greater than that of the House of Representatives, whose members were elected for short, two-year terms.

Bob LaFollette was eager and ready to return to Washington, D. C. to begin his march to the top of federal politics, and he trusted that his supporters in Wisconsin would keep the reform wave going. That hope met with disappointment, however, when his chosen successor for the governorship, Phil Lenroot, was narrowly defeated in 1906.

Bob and Belle immediately set about analyzing this 1906 election result and soon came to the conclusion that the unfavorable outcome was mainly due to the predominantly Democratic voting Norwegians of Wisconsin. The entire United States suffered the ravages of a severe alcoholism epidemic in the years after 1900 (which was the reason why such specifically hard-drinking countries as the US, Russia and Finland later passed prohibition laws). Of all the ethnic groups in the USA - with the exception of the Indians, who had long since been corrupted by the Astors in this respect - the Norwegians did the worst. The Norwegians are the heaviest drinkers in Europe at home and were already too demoralized to follow the example of their hard-drinking neighbors, the Russians and Finns, and experiment with Prohibition⁴³.

Lenroot did not speak Norwegian - just like Bob - and the opposition took advantage of this and brought the Norwegians to their side under Lenroot's nose. Thelen was almost as hysterical about this as his Jewish editor Oscar Handlin⁴⁴, claiming that Lenroot's 1906 defeat was "the worst political humiliation of LaFollette's career"[^]

This setback of 1906 - which LaFollette and Lenroot made up for two years later, in 1908 - was, of course, just a pustule^{ne} of a malignant brain tumor when compared to LaFollette's defeat in 1912 at the hands of Teddy Roosevelt's Judas-like betrayal - a defeat that in reality marked the beginning of the end for the entire corrupt United States. The reason why Thelen was unable to see the wood for the trees was this: Much like the German court historians with all their

nonsense about Hitler, Thelen's mind was narrowed by prejudice and hatred, and that aPdn because LaFollette was a decent man. If you are venal yourself, you like to believe in the cynical formula "Every man has his price" and get angry when you meet the living proof that this sentence is not true. If only Bob had been a despicable scoundrel like Teddy Roosevelt, Woody Wilson or Frank Roosevelt, then Thelen, Handlin and all the other American court historians would suddenly understand Bob's career and its importance to US history far better.

LaFollette in the US Senate;
the struggle for reforms at federal level begins

LaFollette entered the U.S. Senate on January 4, 1906, and soon took the lead in the fight to ban child labor and end the unclean and unhealthy conditions in the American food and pharmaceutical industries. The latter were subjected to government control by Bob's Pure Food and Drug Administration. Although this FDA still exists today, Bob would be appalled-though not surprised-to realize how corrupt and ineffective it has become in recent decades'6^ Bob hit the nail on the head with the remark that he must have looked like some kind of rare person to the federal establishment in Washington/D. C. like some kind of rare wild boar. He might have added that they intended to kill this boar47.

If you want to understand the genesis of modern American consumerism - including everything that Ralph Nader has recently advocated - then you should study LaFollette's 1906 Senate speeches, which are invariably masterpieces of powerful clarity, packed with facts and statistics. Indeed, within a year, Bob eclipsed Daniel Webster and Henry Clay to become the best orator the Senate had ever known, as well as the most effective floor leader48. But do not approach this reading lightly and without an idea of the extent of Bob's personal achievement: one of his speeches, which began on April 19, 1906 and continued for several days, appeared in print as an immaculate document of 148 closely printed pages49.

Many senators - often severely hungover and unaccustomed to intense brain activity - were absent during Bob's big speeches, but the audience gallery was filled to capacity, because the American people loved their "Fighting Bob" - no matter how much the plutocrats scolded them for it. The people prayed for his victory and shared his dream of the "other" USA, of a country of courage and decency instead of the deception and fear that had always existed until 190650^

LaFollette traveled the Far West during the 1906 summer vacation and spoke everywhere. For the ordinary pioneer citizens in the area - including my own relatives at the time in California, Oregon, Utah and Montana - it was a unique

experience, for the entire region had never heard a speaker of this caliber. Prior to 1906, Bob had only appeared as a Chautauqua orator in the East and Midwest. One need only compare LaFollette's flawless speeches on this tour to, say, a speech by California Governor Leland Stanford to his legislature in 1863, of which he was exceedingly proud, claiming absurdly, for example, that the South would lose the Civil War because the schools in the North were better^{5^}

Although Leland Stanford was the most famous man⁵² in the Far West of the USA in the 19th century, comparing his speeches with LaFollette's is like putting Brüning's⁵³ speeches next to Hitler's. He was the most famous American orator. There has never been an American orator to equal Bob LaFollette. Master orators of the 19th century like Daniel Webster and Henry Clay would have been considered artificial and overly calculated in Bob's day, just as Winston Churchill's speeches in the 20th century seem banal and unimaginative compared to Bob's. Teddy Roosevelt and Woody Wilson were known as miserable orators. Kaiser Wilhelm said after one of Teddy's speeches at Berlin University in 1910 that there was nothing worth hearing and nothing worth seeing apart from Teddy's justifiably famous protruding teeth. Finally, Frank Roosevelt was boring, repetitive and mediocre as a speaker - despite all the Jewish propaganda to the contrary.

The rise of Woodrow Wilson

Like all other plutocratic oligarchies in the West from ancient Carthage onwards, the US establishment from George Washington to Frank Roosevelt and beyond benefited from the anonymity in which it was able to conceal its corrupt political henchmen. American legislators at both the state and federal level habitually made lavish campaign promises, only to renege on those pledges afterwards in favor of plutocratic evildoers. LaFollette had found in Wisconsin that it was as popular as it was effective to read out the legislature's attendance records in public speeches, thus showing the contrast between former promises and actual performance of the individual legislator. He used this strategy on his 1906 tour of the Far West, with the result that what he said spread like wildfire. In doing so, he gave his progressive disciples in the US Congress and state governments a lesson that they could use to devastating effect in their own battles against the evildoers.

A good example makes it clear that this tactic could not only be used against corrupt parliamentarians. When Woody Wilson made his very first move into politics-in 1910 in New Jersey as the stooge of J. P. Morgan and his local Irish Democrat bosses-he had burned his ships at Princeton University (of which he had been president for eight years) with his outrageous smears of Andrew West, a distinguished Princeton scholar (who had been offered, among other things, the presidency of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the most

prestigious technical college in the entire United States). The former Princeton students took West's side against Wilson by 10:1 in 1910, and when Wilson claimed in a speech to them in Pittsburgh that his fight against West was "a fight for democracy", he was showered with laughter⁵⁴

For Wilson in 1910, the choice was clear: either he made it in politics in New Jersey, or he had to return to the dull, lackluster academic career he had pursued with increasing reluctance before his appointment at Princeton. His first published essay had been on Bismarck, but it had been nothing more than a plagiarized translation of an article by Professor Marquardson at the German University of Erlangen, and this was emblematic of the lack of scholarly originality that constantly plagued Wilson as a professor. Moreover, his extramarital sexual escapades accumulated over the years and became a source of intense embarrassment⁵⁵

All of Wilson's statements on public affairs prior to 1910 were reactionary—including his persistent advocacy of the introduction of cabinet government in the manner of the English plutocracy, even though this was surely the most hypocritical and reactionary political system in the world since 1690, and one, moreover, that had been guilty of more genocidal crimes than any other regime in history⁵⁶, which had been guilty of more genocidal crimes than any other regime in history⁵⁶ Wilson apparently took a perverse pleasure in excusing shameful British crimes of this kind, such as his fanatical defense of British extermination measures against the South African Franco-German-Dutch Boers as recently as the Fourth Anglo-Boer War of 1899-1902. These included the deliberate British policy of burning down all the farms and storehouses of the Transvaal and the deaths of an officially admitted ten thousand Boer women and twenty thousand Boer children in British concentration camps⁵⁷

Had he been free to choose in 1910, Wilson would have entered American politics more as a hardline reactionary, but that was no longer possible after the successful work of Fighting Bob and in the reformist atmosphere he had created. So Wilson pretended to be a so-called born-again progressive after securing his gubernatorial election in New Jersey with the help of a few Democrats, the same ones he put in jail within a year.

George Record's fight against Wilson

Like all great liars, Wilson was full of deceit. His ostensible conversion temporarily fooled many people, including George Record, who was a personal friend of Bob's and for several years the leader of New Jersey's Republican Party Progressive Movement. When Record reported that Wilson was the first Democrat in New Jersey to pay tribute to progressivism, Bob agreed that Record should reach across party lines to support Wilson at the federalst ate

level. American progress^{le} rn was about the good of the people, not party success.

Wilson skillfully dissembled in public during his two short years as governor of New Jersey, but alongside that he made dirty private deals with Jewish evildoers such as Louis Brandeis; who wrecked American domestic politics and put loyalty to world Zionism above loyalty to the United States, or with Henry Morgenthau Sr, the evil New York financier whose son would later become FDR's neighbor, friend and collaborator, then Edward Mandeli House, whose father owed his wealth to privateering ventures against Texas ports during the Civil War and who - like most Jewish intellectuals in the US - advocated that the country be absorbed into a radical, messianic world state, and Bernard Baruch, the unscrupulous Jew from South Carolina who was Wilson's best friend before and after the USA's entry into the First World War, who used his friendship with Wilson to become a permanent parasitic manipulator of many later US presidents as EiderStatesman, who said to General George Marshall in 1938 after the peace-saving Munich Conference: "We will thrash that fellow Hitler" and who made money out of the 1898 war in the same depraved way that Nathan Rothschild based his financial foreign domination of England on the Battle of Waterloo and his related fraud on the entire money-investing public of England^{58^}

Record first became suspicious of Wilson after his lies and shenanigans at the 1912 Democratic convention in Bai- timore, and Wilson's debt account grew rapidly for Record during the few years leading up to Wilson's permanent mental derangement. By the time Wilson left for France in 1919, it was clear to George Record that he and other trusted New Jersey Republican progressives had been hoodwinked by one of the most devious political criminals in human history, and that it was his duty - as an unsuspecting midwife to Wilson's political rise, as an America-thinking patriot and as a sincere humanitarian - to do everything he could to end Wilson's career before this sadistic psychopath could unleash even greater horrors on the United States and all mankind.

Record accomplished his heroic deed, which can be compared to St. George's slaying of the dragon, by taking Bob's 1906 experience as an example: He wrote a long open letter to Wilson in France - a letter that became one of the few classic texts in American political literature along with the John Adams/Tbomas Jefferson correspondence of 1809-1826 and John Adams' even older book of 178 759^ The contents of Record's 1919 open letter to Wilson have often been quoted in detail and need not concern us here; suffice it to say that George Record told President Wilson point-blank that his presence in France could only lead to more misery for all concerned - Americans and Europeans alike - and that he owed his country at least the one sensible gesture of returning, quickly

and forever, to forgive its errors and allow the nation to resume its reform efforts where they had been so rudely and unceremoniously interrupted six and a half years earlier by Wilson's presidential bid. Now, it need hardly be said that Wilson, the grand spokesman, who was wont to become hysterical in the face of constructively critical words unless they came from his Jewish advisors, played ostrich and simply ignored the political dynamite in Record's open letter. But what did it matter, since Wilson's period of political success, brief as it was, was long gone anyway. It might seem incredible given the catastrophic and enduring impact Wilson made on the entire world in the 20th century, but the period of his political successes was limited to the short eight years from his election as governor of New Jersey (1910) to his defeat in the congressional elections in November 1918.

LaFollette in the west of the USA:
Fight against the plundering and destruction of nature

The pinnacle of aesthetic pleasure for Bob and Belle was their trip down the Columbia River on their 1906⁶¹ tour, both from the American Middle Border (a happy expression of the late Harriet Garland), where there were no mountains. The Columbia is the largest river in the U.S. in terms of water volume and is second in the entire Western Hemisphere to⁶² the Amazon, the largest river on earth. But the Columbia River also flows through some of the most majestic mountain scenery in the world, especially where it cuts through the 3,000-foot Cascade Mountains, forming canyons and gorges⁶². After⁶³ Bob returned to what he publicly and privately called the "dear old rotten Senate"⁶³.

Speeches were only the first phase of LaFollette's activity in the American Far West. He returned to support Gifford Pinchot of Yale University in his desperate struggle to save the dwindling natural resources of the United States. Pinchot had personally studied the successful conservation policies of France and Germany. In fact, LaFollette's help was Pinchot's strongest asset in 1906, but that did not prevent this typical New England snob (which Pinchot was, even if he saw rightly on the important issue of conservation) from succumbing to Teddy Roosevelt's intrigues in 1912 and stabbing Bob in the back⁶⁴.

Thelen, the typical court historian, sought to reverse the Cain-Abel relationship in the Roosevelt-LaFollette relationship after the fact. If only Thelen could have shown that Bob had somehow attacked Teddy before 1912 (either during his presidency or afterward, when Teddy was busy denouncing the villainy of his hand-picked successor, William Howard Taft), that would have cast Roosevelt's 1912 betrayal in a milder light and as justified. But no, there was nothing of the sort, so Thelen could do nothing but invent the wild

hypothesis that Bob was somehow keeping his "bitter resentment" against Roosevelt a secret⁶⁵.

How can you keep secret something you never knew about or owned? First of all, Bob was fully aware of Teddy's shortcomings for years, including his shady dealings with J.P. Morgan, Kuhn, Loeb and Company and other plutocratic financial conglomerates, but Bob was a kind man who also gave Teddy full credit for his few good beginnings during his presidency. Second, as an education fanatic, Bob hoped to bring out the good that might be in Teddy and bring it to fruition. And third, he knew William Blake's poem *The Poison Tree* and did not harbor the secret aversion that Thelen fantasizes about because such negative sentiments poison the one who harbors them. That Bob was later righteously and publicly angry about Teddy's sordid act of open betrayal in 1912 - a betrayal not only of Bob, but of his own honor and that of the entire American people - is another matter.

Bob gave speeches for Chautauqua in seventeen states in the Far West, Midwest, South, and East in 1907, and the main theme of all these speeches was this: How can individualistic competitiveness and popular responsibility for the Can they be brought into harmony together? Every American educator is familiar with the schizoid situation in which students are simultaneously preached to conform and to be independent. Bob - like Regel - saw no contradiction here, because both could be reconciled. This reminds one of the fact that a few years later, a young Independent MP in the French Chamber, Pierre Laval, when asked whether he would vote for the red flag of the Second International or the tricolor, cleverly replied: both.

Parallels in Europe

Political simpletons like August Bebel, the German Marxist leader who made his subversive SPD the strongest party in the German Reichstag until his death in 1913, chose only the red flag and had to dance to the tune of their Jewish masters and masters of the kind of Karl Kautsky. LaFollette's thesis of 1907 was similar to that of Hans Grimm thirty years later on his sensational lecture tour of England: it was simply a necessity to find room for both the creativity of the individual and the needs of the modern masses. Hitler advocated "common good before self-interest", and the egocentric Spanish philosopher Ortega y Gasset⁶⁶ therefore claimed that Hitler was akin to Lenin and Stalin in sacrificing the creativity of the individual to the dictatorship of a mindless proletariat, but Grimm was able to reassure his English audience with sovereign certainty that Hitler had no such intention. Although Grimm disapproved of Hitler's refusal to reclaim the colonies stolen from Germany in

1919, and although he had voted against Hitler in the referendum held in August 1934 after Hindenburg's death, he knew that Hitler - unlike Lenin and Stalin - was the last to strike a blow against creative individuality, the highest of all values, which had been eradicated in Russia by Jewish Bolshevism.

"Grimm explained in his lectures in England (which were received with great applause outside the English establishment) that the political repressive measures in Hitler's Germany were a temporary necessity after the outrageous 1918 Wilsonian obliteration of Germany and after the 1919-1933 mismanagement of Weimar Germany - similar to the deliberate inflationary policy of the USA in the Revolutionary War 1775-1783, which also did not mean that the USA wanted to have "soft" money forever. Hitler was never in favor of the oppression of the majority by a minority of professional revolutionaries, as practiced by Bolshevism and expressed in terrorist Leninism and Stalinism.

Lenin and Stalin - one a Jewish half-breed, the other a Jew-hater, but Jew-benefactor - adopted the Jewish Kramo- la terrorism that had been practiced incessantly in Russia since 1879 by the worldwide Jewish conspiracy, since it provided a specific result: continued power and wealth for the hated, alien regime of the Jews in Russia from 1917 on. Neither Lenin nor Stalin ever believed in Hegel's freedom of the individual, nor in Marx's fanciful utopian assertion that one day the state would die in favor of a robotic society of single-minded, anarchy-loving mass men. They both knew, as did all their successors, that their eternally hated slave regime would not survive a free vote.

After his coup and seizure of power in 1917, Lenin alone was responsible for the liquidation of more than six million Soviet, previously Russian, subjects, and Stalin massacred at least forty million Soviet subjects. These butchers of men (Roosevelt and Churchill raved about Stalin in 1941) could never hope to be liked or even loved by even a small minority of their people, nor to survive even one day in politics, were freedom to be restored. Ergo: Wherever the red boot treads, freedom perishes forever.

At the peace negotiations in Brest-Litovsk in 1918, the infamous red terrorists had the impudence to demand that the German plenipotentiary, General Hoffmann, "return" Congress Poland⁶⁸ to the Jewish reign of terror that Poland had not yet experienced. Until 1945, Poland was luckier than Hungary, which had to taste the horrors of the Jewish Red murderous rule under Bela Kun Cohen in 1919, because Poland was repeatedly protected by Germany until 1945. There were very few Poles in the so-called Eastern Poland that Hitler let fall to Stalin in 1939 - it was mainly inhabited by Ukrainians, Belarusians, Lithuanians and Jews. It was the most complete nonsense and criminal hypocrisy when the Allies declared in Potsdam in 1945 that Poland had to be handed over large areas of highly developed German territory - which had never

been Polish - to compensate the Poles for the loss of eastern Poland, which in reality was just a vast non-Polish region conquered in the wars of aggression waged by the Polish imperialists in 1919 and 1920⁶⁹

At Brest-Litovsk in 1918, where a victorious Germany respected the right to self-determination and refrained from annexations, the Germans' only goal was to establish a fair and lasting order in Eastern Europe - with the exception of the USSR - based on self-respect and self-determination of individuals and peoples. That is why Trotsky was asked by Hoffmann whether he seriously imagined that the Poles wanted Red rule? The murderous Trotsky replied coolly and arrogantly that after a few months of occupation by the Red Army (i.e. mass murder, rape and plunder) the Poles would probably be ready to accept Red rule.

This was the chaos of bullets and murder in Eastern Europe that Frank Roosevelt and Winston Churchill so ardently desired before and during the Second World War-and their goal was achieved in 1945. The perverse, bloodthirsty Churchill simply called it a Hun hunt, but in reality it was not the Germans but the Soviets who were the Huns, and the victims of the Soviet Jewish commissars and the countless Jewish generals were the flowering of the white race in Europe⁷⁰.

None of this red barbarism had the slightest thing to do with Hitler, who was a freedom-loving, sincerely individualistic and highly creative and artistic man, who had shown civil courage and personality as a conscientious objector to military service (1907-1913) in the old multinational Austria-Hungary, and who in 1919 refused to take part in bloody reprisals against the former Jewish red terrorist dictators of Bavaria, even though he himself had once been their hostage and - like the later great Pope Pius XII.'t, papal nuncio in Germany at the time - had been threatened with death.

Hitler was working for the day when Germany would return to a state of normalcy - which had not existed since 1918 as a result of Wilson's criminally subversive political campaign against Germany - and when a freely elected German Senate (Hitler's own invention) would replace the hated, foreign Weimar Constitution of 1919. This miserably inferior constitution of the Jew Dr. Hugo Preuss remained Germany's basic law from 1919 to 1945, because Hitler, unlike the American "founding fathers" of 1787, would never have convened a constituent assembly under abnormal circumstances, and also because the old German normality destroyed by Wilson in 1918 could never return thanks to Lord Halifax, Winston Churchill, Frank Roosevelt and Josef Stalin. In order to see the Weimar constitution replaced by a truly German constitution under normal conditions, Hitler would have had to become as old as Methuselah. Although it is now out of force, the Weimar Constitution has not been replaced by a German constitution, just as no serious attempt has ever been made to

restore the old unity and sovereignty of Germany. The West German Basic Law of 1949-far from being truly German-was written by the leftist, anti-German Harvard professor Carl Friedrich and imposed on Germany by American bayonets-not unlike when US Undersecretary of the Navy Frank Roosevelt wrote and imposed a foreign constitution on ostensibly independent, French-speaking Haiti in 1915, using the bayonets and martial law of the invading US Marines.

Unlike Lenin and Stalin, Hitler demonstrated an outstanding talent for electoral campaigns for more than a dozen years during the Weimar Republic. Lenin, on the other hand, lost the 1918 election to a constituent assembly (the so-called Provisional Assembly), which had been called by his predecessor Kerensky and which Lenin had allowed after his putsch of November 1917 out of sheer curiosity. But as soon as it was clear that Jewish Bolshevism - although already in power for two months with all its despicable terror - had suffered a crushing defeat in this very last free Russian election, Lenin simply had the assembly closed on the first day of the session, the non-Bolshevik deputies arrested and most of them killed. Although the terrorist of the French Revolution of 1789-1795, Max Isidore Robespierre from Picardy, had 20,000 people beheaded in Paris alone, he was almost a pacifist saint compared to Lenin. Stalin had advised his friend Lenin against the 1918 election in the first place and never dreamed of allowing even sham elections during his bloody 24 years as supreme Soviet leader. That Frank Roosevelt and Winston Churchill revered such a man, and that Churchill called him such a great man and great ruler in 1941, shows that while these two were not quite as powerful as Stalin, morally they were not one iota better than him.

When Hans Grimm declared in England in 1937 that the highest creative values of the individual were just as respected in Hitler's Germany as anywhere else in the world, but that he detested nothing more than "massification", the reduction of humanity to its lowest common denominator to create the servile mass man - he was telling the pure truth and doing so from indisputable personal experience: Grimm, one of the great literary geniuses of the 20th century, had never been a member of the Nazi Party, but had already known Hitler personally for a decade before his trip to England in 1937. Although he had never been a member of the NSDAP, he had known Hitler personally for a decade before his trip to England in 1937.

LaFollette's political concepts and values of 1907 were similar to those already held by the young Hitler⁷², and so was the later Hitler - the artist, politician, statesman and soldier - during the 26 years of his political career from 1919 to 1945, when he was able to address his beloved German people publicly (for part of this time he was silenced by the corrupt leaders of the Weimar

Republic). These two leaders, LaFollette and Hitler, were as much alike as two leaders can be, for both were utterly decent, and both were fanatically committed to the same socio-economic and political ideal: the betterment of the average person in their respective countries on the basis of nationalism and national independence. Their strategy was probably very different - but only because the internal mechanism of the American situation 1900-1925 was so different from the situation in Germany 1919-1945.

Exposing the financial oligarchy

Reactionary creatures of the American plutocracy instigated an ugly uprising against Bob in the frontier town of Wal- la/Washington in the Columbia River Valley in 1907 - but Bob, like Hitler, was supremely resilient. The plutocrats were wrong if they thought they could intimidate him. Wild Washington had only become a state in 1889, just 18 years before Bob's second visit. All of these towns in the wheat-growing region of the American Far West had been shamelessly exploited and driven into extreme poverty by the railroad plutocrats⁷³^

Bob booked a major public success in Seattle, Washington, which had surpassed its older neighbor two hundred miles away, Portland, Oregon, as the largest city in the American Northwest. Seattle's rapid growth was largely due to the fact that it was the natural port of departure to the gold deposits on the Yukon and in Alaska. Bob was fully endorsed by the largest Northwest daily newspaper, the Seattle Star. However, his greatest public success in the Far West as a whole came in 1907 in the Golden Gate city of San Francisco, which had been almost wiped out the previous year by the largest American earthquake of all time - one that could be compared with the most significant earthquake in Europe, the 1755 Lisbon earthquake. Lisbon had been quickly rebuilt in 1756 with the help of diamonds from Portuguese Brazil, and San Francisco was rebuilt in 1907 with the help of gold from the Yukon and Alaska. Bob's speeches in San Francisco were electrifying: they instantly triggered the overthrow of the corrupt urban political "machine" and paved the way for the triumph of progressivism in California as a whole⁷⁴.

Barely back in the U.S. Senate, LaFollette exposed the American financial oligarchy to the gaze and judgment of the American people during 1907 and 1908. He took particular aim at the no less than one hundred money nabobs, Jewish and non-Jewish, associated with the Standard Oil Company and other rockefeller enterprises. In order to eliminate competition in the Cleveland/Ohio oil industry, John D. Rockefeller Sr. enlisted the help of the Anglo-French-Austrian Rothschilds during the 1880s and became their main henchman in the

USA75 until his death at the age of 91 in 1937. Rockefeller and his main ally in the banking world, J. P. Morgan (who called himself a pirate and had a black flag with a skull and crossbones hoisted on his yacht Corsair), received LaFollette's undivided attention because "they dominate and control the business and industry of this country"76.

The material Bob presented on the Morgan-Rockefeller criminal financial operations was as extensive as it was startling in its consequences. Both Morgan and Rockefeller were cruel and relentless men of insatiable greed, and both were outside the law: even President Teddy Roosevelt, after a conversation with Morgan after the Panic of 1907, had to admit that he realized that his own power was nothing against Morgan's. Bob proved in the pages of the Congressional Record that this terrible financial panic had been deliberately and artificially instigated by Rockefeller and Morgan for personal gain. The accompanying wave of bankruptcies and suicides became a source of great joy for the two. Bob openly and clearly showed how Morgan was able to expand his steel monopoly thanks to the panic, and how Rockefeller did the same with his oil monopoly.

The "Money Trust" does its biggest business:
The USA and the First World War

Adding to this sordid crime is the fact that Morgan and Rockefeller knew full well that England only allowed its citizens to travel on Russian or Japanese ships at their own risk during the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-190577, but that both nevertheless advised President Wilson during the American neutrality at the beginning of World War I to claim the right of American citizens to travel under official U.S. protection on ships of belligerent England - leading to the Lusitania affair (1915) and other incidents, the right of American citizens to travel on ships of belligerent England under official U.S. protection - which led to the Lusitania Affair (1915) and other incidents that were used as a sham pretext for American military aggression against Germany.

Men like Wilson, Morgan, Rockefeller and Baruch deserved to be sued for war crimes after 1918 - and not German front-line infantrymen and V-boat officers who had only done their duty but had to face charges and convictions in accordance with the shameful provisions of the Versailles Treaty. International lawyers had clearly stated at the London International Conference on the Law of the Sea in 1909: The supply of war material is only legal at wartime if it is offered on equal terms to both belligerents. The USA had acceded to the London resolutions - so Woody Wilson was also a criminal against international law according to American opinion.

During the American sham neutrality of 1914-1917, Morgan and Rockefeller

skimmed billions of dollars from such unilateral lies^{feru} ng and loans to England and France, which would have been ^{declared} illegal had Wilson not been a war criminal himself^{ge} . William Jennings Bryan, Wilson's Secretary of State, had to resign in 1915^{ge} because Wilson refused to pursue a legal course. The illegal American arms deliveries and loans to England and France kept the war going in the West even after military and economic blunders had brought the Anglo-French alliance to the brink of exhaustion around the middle of 1915. Should Germany ever again become a sovereign and free nation, its government could at any time, on a legal basis and in all fairness, present the USA with a bill for damages amounting to trillions of dollars - a sum to which Germany would be entitled today, but which could not revive the millions of Europeans slaughtered without right or reason after 1915: People who only had to die so that the American plutocratic evildoers could grow even fatter and, above all, even more evil than they already were in 1907-1908, when Fighting Bob exposed and denounced them in the US Senate for the benefit of the people.

Bob was in full agreement with Edward Ross's great study "Sin and Society"⁷⁸ If the American super-rich wrongdoers - called by Bob the Money Trust - were not one day punished, there could never be a true system of law and justice in this prematurely decrepit, corrupt and decadent United States⁹ Seventy years on, that promise of justice, LaFollette made to his American people is still unfulfilled, but the most ignorant American can now see that, fortunately, the antiquated and rotten American regime of plutocratic oligarchy is falling apart faster and faster.

The Federal Reserve System and Zionism

Meanwhile, in 1907-1913, the most sinister monetary conspiracy in the entire history of the USA, as instigated by Morgan, Rockefeller and their countless Jewish international lenders and banking colleagues, was in full swing. It began with the artificial banking panic of 1907 and culminated - after the interlude of the secret Sea Island/Georgia conference - in 1913 in the so-called Federal Reserve System of American banking, in which President Wilson and the ultra-reactionary Senator Carter Glass of Virginia played midwives. The success of the conspiracy fulfilled the demand of the 1897 Basel World Zionist Congress that control of the US monetary system be placed firmly and irrevocably in the hands of world Jewry. Louis Brandeis, who became a Zionist in 1897 and Wilson's chief adviser on domestic policy in 1913, who, thanks to Wilson, was the first Jew to be appointed to the Supreme Court of the supposedly Christian USA^{8°}, who was appointed head of American Zionism because of his successes with Wilson, and who held this position with honor.^{he}

who, on the orders of the English and French Zionist leaders Weizmann and Weill, ordered Wilson to enter the First World War - the same Brandeis who, like Wilson, pretended to be a friend of the average American citizen, told Wilson that he need have no compunction about handing over permanent control of the American monetary system to world Jewry.

One need only read the opus of the founding pioneer of Zionism, the Viennese Jew Theodor Herzl,⁸¹ to encounter an authoritarian plan that goes far beyond anything advocated by the political right - whether in 1918 by Corneliu Zalea Codreanu, the Romanian founder of European fascism in 1918, Benito Mussolini, the founder of Italian fascism in 1919, Adolf Hitler, who became the leader of German National Socialism in 1919, or Leon Degrelle, the leader of Belgian and Burgundian fascism. Only Leninism and Stalinism and the post-Stalinist ideology of the USSR and its Bolshevism, embodied by the CPSU, come close to Jewish-Zionist authoritarianism.

One must remember the words of the French ideologist Alexander Ledru-Rollin from the 1840s: If one politician goes too far to the left and another too far to the right, they will meet each other last. Everyone knows that these modern terms "right" and "left" derive from the seating arrangement in French parliamentary practice following the French Revolution of 1789 (the most discussed subject of European historiography), and one need only imagine the amphitheater-like arrangement extended a little further to the point where, as in a circular theater of English Elizabethan times, the right and the left actually meet. Marx had been the most extreme authoritarian ideologue in the world before Herzl, but in 1871, to forestall an attempt by the Russian anarchist Mikhail Bakunin to destroy the Marxian First International, Marx suddenly pretended that his ultimate goal was not a^{star} state but, on the contrary, the abolition of the state.^{mu} This paradoxical political spectrum of opposites^{ha} must be grasped if one wants to understand in a dialectical-scientific way the unshakeable unity between chauvinist Zionism and Bolshevism in the 20th century - one as a nationalist ideology of the right, the other as an ideology of the left with the aim of abolishing every nationality on earth with the exception of the Jewish one.

It was fortunate for world Jewry that in the first half of the 20th century-the period of the strongest Jewish drive for world domination since Titus had destroyed the subversive Jewish conspiratorial nest of Jerusalem in the year 7082 -particularly evil American political leaders of the caliber of Teddy Roosevelt, Woody Wilson and Frank Roosevelt were available.

Lindbergh's father fights against Wilson's war

With the exception of the indissoluble link between Zionism and Bolshevism in the 20th century, LaFollette and Lindbergh also clearly recognized the situation - Charles Lindbergh Sr. from Minnesota, Wisconsin's neighbor. But while the bond between Zionism and Bolshevism remained hidden to Bob, he hated both. He accused Wilson of being a Zionist stooge after 1917. And when Bob made a desperate third presidential bid in 1924 in the hope of overturning the evil Versailles Treaty and the American Communists tried to infiltrate his movement, he replied that he would rather lose a thousand battles without them than win one with their help.

The way Wilson persecuted Bob's personal friend Lindbergh - father of the 1927 Atlantic flyer and America's most popular folk hero before Pearl Harbor - bordered on insanity⁸³. Lindbergh Sr. served ten years in Congress before Wilson thrust the U.S. into World War I and was Minnesota's most popular politician, having also earned a reputation in other fields, such as farming, banking and law enforcement. Lindbergh ran for governor of Minnesota in 1918 on an anti-Wilson platform. During one of his speeches, Wilson hooligans beat up his waiting chauffeur. Although Lindbergh rescued the driver and got him back on his feet, their car was still riddled with bullets as they left the scene.

The chauffeur was horrified when Lindbergh Sr. forbade him to increase the speed so that they would not think they were afraid - and, hardly surprisingly, quit his job after this incident. Lindbergh then hired his 16-year-old son Charles as his driver for the rest of the campaign, and the two men were in mortal danger so often that it is impossible to list them here. Once during the same campaign, Lindbergh Sr. was kidnapped and taken outside of Minnesota. As soon as he was freed, he immediately resumed his campaign. Wilson's agents stormed the publishing house where Lindbergh's masterful 1918 book, *Your Country at War*, had been published - a must-read book because in it he proved conclusively that America's war effort to destroy Europe was made only in the interests of American plutocratic miscreants. The agents not only destroyed the stocks of this book and melted down the printing plates (so that a new edition could not be published until 1934), but also destroyed plates and stocks of Lindbergh's pre-war book *"Banking and Currency"*. It is a misfortune for the world that Lindbergh's son, a hero and brave man as he was, did not have the same courage, character and determination as his father (not to mention Fighting Bob). Had Lindbergh Jr. had the stature of his father, he would in all likelihood have prevented Frank Roosevelt's bid for a third term in 1940⁸⁴.

LaFollette, on the other hand, could and would have prevented the attempt by world Jewry to make the USA its new base if he had been elected president in 1912 - and England would never have dared to unleash the First World War in 1914 under such circumstances. As a mere senator, however, Bob lacked sufficient influence to thwart the Jewish plot, but he was at least able to delay

the Jewish timetable from time to time. Although sick with influenza and feverish, he rose on May 29, 1908 to deliver a filibuster (obstructionist) speech against the Aldrich-Vreeland Money Bill, a bill that would hand over control of American currency to the Jews as an essential part of Teddy Roosevelt's second presidential bid. Teddy Roosevelt and Woody Wilson were constantly competing to see which of them was the most pro-Jewish American.

Bob's incredible prescience saved his life once in that 1908 battle. Naturally, he needed some kind of nourishment during these endless hours of speeches, which were intended⁸⁶ n to first delay the adoption of the bill and then make it impossible. When he was handed the usual glass of milk with two raw, scrambled eggs, which had been prepared in the Senate restaurant, he rejected it and demanded that it be analyzed. And what did they find? Enough poison to kill a dozen people! Bob talked for nineteen full hours this time, even though he was ill and had narrowly escaped murder. Then he left the continuation to his friend from Missouri, Senator Bill Stone. Stone spoke for seven hours, then it was the turn of another friend of Bob's, Senator Tom Gore of Oklahoma. This obstructionist practice was nothing more than the application of a traditional right of the minority in the US Senate to slow down and prevent the hasty passage of ill-conceived legislation, and had often been exploited by Southern senators in the Civil War era⁸⁶^.

But lest one assume that Bob's overlong speech on the international money cartel was about quantity at the expense of quality, read the printed version of the speech, for which there was a huge demand in the American East, where expertise on international arbitrage, currency control and money in general was widespread⁸⁷^.

In fact, all the material for an excellent book on monetary issues, such as Groseclose's⁸⁸ , could be taken from LaFollette's printed speeches in the Congressional Record of 1908 (including the long speech mentioned above, which was published in Washington/D. C. as a separate book). No American senator before or since has been so well informed on the currency question in general and the criminal operations of the great American financial corporations in particular. On this vital issue - with its decisive importance for the fate of the world in the 20th century - Bob was the best expert the USA could produce. An impressive group of non-Jewish businessmen from the American East proudly declared their approval of Bob's 1908 financial analysis, which also opened the eyes of Henry Ford Sr. in the Midwest, the pioneer and hero of the American automobile industry, to the dangerous Jewish problem⁸⁹^.

LaFollette reaches for the US presidency

Before LaFollette, and especially in the early years of the Populist movement of 1875-1897, there was a widespread belief among radical political reformers

out in the country that in a vast country like the United States, only a few issues needed to be addressed at the federal level, but that otherwise local and regional solutions could do the most for the welfare of all America. Bob, however, taught his Progressive reformers of 1908 that any local solution would prove ephemeral and ultimately useless until the United States came clean at the federal level⁹⁰. The miserable fate of Louisiana after the Jewish terrorist murder of Huey Long in 1935 is a case in point.

Bob's own LaFollette for President campaign was formally launched on October 29, 1907, when Bob was 52 and Belle was 47. John Commons, never surpassed top historian of the labor movement of his day, proudly proclaimed in the national *North American Review*, "The present of Wisconsin is the future of America⁹¹." This compliment from the top academic expert in the most important field of those years was the best Bob could ever receive and was worth more than that of a hundred Teddy Roosevelts or a hundred Woody Wilsons.

The proud and freedom-loving badger had been the emblem of Wisconsin since it became the 30th state to join the United States. Because LaFollette was so proud of Wisconsin's progressivist reformist accomplishments, he wanted his presidential campaign to be done nationwide by his native Wisconsin "Badgers". That was no problem in the Midwest, the Far West and the South. The Midwest and Far West were sympathetic to Wisconsin, and the South had been a one-party Democratic region since the end of Republican Reconstruction in 1877 (including 15 years of martial law arrests and military occupation of certain parts of the South), where neither Bob nor any other Republican candidate could hope to win a majority in any state. Under the crazy American electoral system with electoral college, however, all votes were irretrievably lost unless they were cast for an absolute or at least a relative majority.

Bob's Wisconsin-oriented presidential campaign, however, became a problem in New England and the mid-Atlantic states of New York, Pennsylvania and New Jersey, where there has traditionally been more political maneuvering and plotting than in any other region of the U.S. and where secret connections are also necessary for any kind of successful political action⁹²^

Bob knew that Progressivism was unlikely to win any of the six states of snooty, corrupt and provincial New England, but he also knew that, despite the undemocratic electoral college system and the so-called "ironclad Democratic South," he could win the 1912 presidential election by capturing the American Midwest, the Far West and one (of the two possible) Mid-Atlantic states - either Pennsylvania or New Jersey. In New York, total Jewish political control after 1900 precluded his victory after he publicly attacked global Jewish financial power in 1908. Capturing the necessary states, however, required Bob's control of the regular Republican Party organization, and he found no more time for

efforts in that direction before the November 1908 presidential election. This is why Teddy Roosevelt was free to choose his successor at that time, and why 1912 - and not 1908 - became the "year of destiny" for the entire United States.

Bob launched LaFollette's Weekly Magazine on January 9, 1909, and soon proved from issue to issue that he was his own best minister of public enlightenment and propaganda. He himself was the editor-in-chief, and Belle handled the family and education sections. She was unsurpassable in these two subordinate but popular and important areas - she knew an unusual amount about home economics, was a recognized expert in comparative education and was also knowledgeable in legal matters. This magazine, which LaFollette launched in 1909 on solid foundations, is still published today under its second name, *The Progressive*.

LaFollette's attendance lists from the parliaments, which formed a chronicle of the achievements of American politicians, were an indispensable section of the magazine, but required a great deal of time and effort to keep up to date. For the first time, they made it possible for American citizens to find out what was going on in the political life of their country. Bob, Belle and all four of their children wrote essays for the magazine, as did the political leaders of American progressivism and pundits from all over the United States. It became an elite magazine for the whole nation, made by people who were able to think abstractly. Alfred Harmsworth (later Lord Northcliffe), the wealthy English sensation journalist from Oxford who later became England's propaganda chief in World War I (and then enticed scholars like Lord Bryce and Arnold Toynbee to prostitute themselves for propaganda purposes), once said he had two kinds of newspapers: the picture papers for people who could see but not read, and the tabloids for people who could read but not think. When he was asked why he did not have a third kind for people who can see, read and think, His Lordship answered truthfully: "There are so few of these that it is not profitable."

The initial circulation of Bob's weekly magazine was 50,000 - half of them subscriptions in Wisconsin, the other half in the rest of the USA. This was enough to spread the good news for modern man. The masthead of the magazine contained the words of the New Testament: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."9s

Bob's interest and attention extended to all 160,000 administrative departments in the USA⁹⁶. At the city level, which England's Lord James Bryce⁹⁷ described as the area in which the US had failed most miserably politically, Bob kept to the city-manager plan, first successfully implemented in Galveston, Texas, after the devastating 1900 Gulf of Mexico flood. This modern and workable plan for city government placed all decision-making power on major issues in the hands of one responsible official, whereas the old city structures with their three departments and mayoral advisory boards had made it

easy for both elected and appointed city leaders to shirk their public responsibilities and become usually successful criminals at the expense of the downtrodden American masses⁹⁸.

The Taft administration

In 1909, after Teddy Roosevelt had supposedly retired from the presidency for good in keeping with his earlier promises, Bob's main problem at the federal level was the corruption and vacillation of Teddy's self-elected successor as president, William Howard Taft. One year in office, Taft had already made so many blunders that it was clear he would not win another election - federal, state or local - even with the help of the corrupt political "machine" inherited from Teddy. President Harding, also from Ohio, later appointed him Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court because he owed him some political favors

Finally, Taft came in third in the 1912 three-way race for the presidency, and most of the votes he got were delivered by his big party machine. The most bizarre aspect of this political fiasco with Taft was that he was continually berated by Teddy, who himself had picked Big Lub (Taft's nickname because he weighed over 300 pounds¹⁰⁰). Because of the weakness of the Democrats, Teddy could have chosen almost anyone to succeed him in 1908, and he chose Taft on the grounds that he was the best man they could find in the country. But no sooner had Taft won the election than Teddy turned around and declared that the successor he had chosen was a danger to the welfare of the country.

Teddy had talked to Big Lub like a child before handing him the White House on March 4, 1909. He even advised Taft to give up golf - probably the only outdoor activity the fat Taft could consider - on the curious grounds that playing golf would make Taft look like an idle creature of the American Pluto oligarchy in the eyes of the country - which accurately described Taft's actual role on the US political scene. Everyone close to Teddy had known that his actual desired successor would have been the chauvinistic and corrupt New York lawyer Elihu Root, who had stolen the Tweed gang's coffers, which he repeatedly represented in court¹⁰¹. To the uninitiated, it seemed like a mystery when Teddy suddenly decided in favor of Taft from Ohio in 1908, but in reality it was not mysterious at all. The decision in favor of Taft simply meant that Teddy was seriously considering a third presidential term for himself in 1912 or 1916, and in the meantime wanted the bumbling Big Lub in the White House rather than the robust and clever Root, so that Teddy would have an easier time explaining his broken campaign promises to the American people. Bob LaFollette immediately read the signs correctly when Teddy chose Taft as his successor in 1908; but as he noted in the later editions of his autobiography¹⁰², he suspected

Teddy had more political savvy than this self-proclaimed Rough Rider and Bull Moose actually possessed. He put himself in Teddy's shoes and quickly realized that 1912 would be too soon for Teddy to make a third presidential bid. The "no third term" tradition had been hallowed in the U.S. since Thomas Jefferson's day, and U.S. Grant had failed in 1880-despite his false and inflated Civil War hero glory-in an attempt to violate it. As it would turn out, Teddy fell flat on his face in 1912 in his attempt to violate tradition-but his pathetic moves and deceptions were enough to ruin something much more significant, Fighting Bob LaFollette's 1912 presidential bid.

In retrospect, it is clear that it was far too impulsive of Teddy to attack his self-selected successor so quickly and to pledge Bob's support against Big Lub so quickly for 1912, while at the same time planning to get himself nominated by the Republicans. Despite Teddy's last-minute deception, Bob was then easily able to prevent Teddy's nomination by the Republicans. Teddy's credibility was also too tarnished to give him the slightest chance for his hastily improvised third party candidacy. This Bull Moose Third Party of his disappeared before the next election in 1916 as quickly as it had appeared. Teddy died in early 1919 at the age of 60, and the last ten years of his life were, even by American political standards, an incredibly fetid pit of depravity and stupidity. When Sir Edward Grey successfully unleashed World War I in 1914, Teddy initially devoted himself to justifying Germany's march through Belgium in the nationally circulated Outlook Magazine, reminding the American people that Kaiser Wilhelm II was a great and kind man, and also Teddy's personal friend. But that didn't stop him from doing a complete U-turn a few months later, when - long before the Lusitania affair concocted by Churchill - he demanded that his political nemesis Woody Wilson should lead the USA into the war as an ally of England. No sooner had Wilson then done him the favor of foolishly and treacherously leading the U.S. into foreign war for no sensible reason than Teddy totally humiliated himself by asking Woody to give him a glamorous military command in Frank^r eich of the sort that President McKinley and his vice Teddy Roosevelt had denied Democratic leader Bryan in Cuba in 1898. Woody's predictable response was that he wouldn't even give Teddy a command in hell, and in the end Teddy was consumed by his anger and wasted away. To paraphrase Shakespeare, Teddy's political career was like a tale told by an idiot, full of noise and fury, but without any sense.

Protective tariff policy and falling real incomes

But back to LaFollette. His outrage at President Taft's corruption and incompetence was as genuine as Teddy's was feigned. As indicated earlier, Bob

believed that moderate and cautious tariff protection for fledgling U.S. industry - similar to the Bismarckian system that had proven successful in Germany since 1879 - was preferable to the illusory free trade utopia under the hypocritical leadership of England. But the Aldrich Protective Tariff Act of 1909, which had been supported by Taft, provided in an incredibly clumsy way for the privileged industries of the wrongdoers to reap huge benefits at the expense of the American people, whose real incomes and real wages fell in 1909-1912 despite the fat profits reaped by Morgan, Rockefeller and their ilk.

Tariffs had traditionally been the most important economic issue facing the United States since the days when the unscrupulous and Anglophile Alexander Hamilton had served as Secretary of the Treasury in President Washington's first cabinet. Hamilton's machinations had caused Thomas Jefferson to resign as Washington's Secretary of State in 1793, forming the very kind of anti-Federalist opposition party that the framers of the second U.S. Constitution had hoped to avoid in Philadelphia in 1787. Chief Justice Fuller of the U.S. Supreme Court had managed in 1895 to rid the U.S. - supposedly forever - of the nightmare of Abe Lincoln's regressive income tax, which was confiscatory in a way that contradicted the Constitution. Until 1913, when the income tax was reinstated by the disastrous 16th Amendment to the Constitution, the tariff was the primary source of revenue for the federal government. Every educated American knew in 1909 that Senator Nelson Aldrich of Rhode Island - the initiator of the protective tariff law of that year - was a hired millionaire stooge of John D. Rockefeller Sr. and Taft committed the incredible folly of passing the exorbitant Aldrich tariff

in the teeth without at least attempting to secure some reductions. No wonder the tariff bill became Bob's main issue in 1909 in his fight against Taft and against his own corrupt congressional colleagues who were rallying behind Aldrich. He won a few good new allies in this fight, including Senator Bill Bourne of Oregon and Senator Bill Borah of Idaho. (Later, in 1919, Bob and Bill Borah were successful leaders in the fight against the approval of the infamous Versailles Treaty). By the time of this 1909 tariff battle, Bob and Belle were finally financially able to move into a nice new house in the fashionable northwest section of the nation's capital, Washington

Despite all the efforts of Bob's friends in the House of Representatives, the outrageous Aldrich Tariff Bill passed - with Republican Representative Sereno Payne leading the fight for Taft - and after a tough, bitter fight, also passed the Senate on August 8, 1909, with a majority of 16 votes. Teddy Roosevelt had never done the slightest thing against American tariff excesses during his entire career in US federal politics, so it seemed more than strange when he now

suddenly came down bitterly on Taft for signing what became known in history as the Payne-Aldrich tariff. Certainly Taft could have easily blocked this disgraceful bill - by a simple veto - but he was no more interested in antagonizing the Morgan-Rockefeller group than Teddy was, and it is hard to imagine that Teddy himself would have stopped the bill had he been in the White House in August 1909.

Bob LaFollette, in the course of the tariff dispute in the US Senate, had explained to the American people how inflation after the Spanish-American War of 1898 had robbed the worker of his real wages. Although wages had increased nominally by 22 percent in 1897-1909, the index of consumer prices had increased by 35 percent over the same period, and as Bob predicted in 1909, this evil trend worsened at the expense of the downtrodden American worker precisely as a result of the anti-consumer tariff for the remaining five years until 1914, when Britain launched its first war of aggression of the 20th century against Germany

The three critical decades of the USA

Anyone familiar with the socioeconomic and technological history of the United States knows that the period of greatest change and transformation to date has been the three decades without major wars, the period from 1865-1895. This was America's era of urbanization, the first department stores, the first multi-family housing, the first fixed prices in commerce, the beginning of general paving of streets in small and large cities, the beginning of mass urban transportation, the completion of the railroad network, the introduction of the automobile and telephone, electric generator and electric light, and the period of a huge agricultural export surpassed in the world only by that of Czarist Russia. This era of greatest change had a far greater practical impact on the lives of ordinary people than any other 30-year period before or since - not excluding the spectacular horrors of the later air, nuclear and space age. It was certainly a period of the most appalling exploitation by the miscreants known in those days as robber barons. There was virtually no leisure, but there was at least some hope, for it was an era of hard deflationary currency, and the federal government was perpetually in financial surplus instead of chronic deficit, as has become common in more recent times since the disastrous presidency of Woody Wilson. From 1865-1895, rental income automatically increased from year to year, as did the value of stock holdings, not to mention interest income.

In the 20th century, the inflationary United States, which experienced the transfer of control of American currency to international financial corporations, gradually became an America of hopeless socioeconomic failure. Certainly, the 20th century was no different than the 19th in that the average American had nothing in either, but in the 19th century there was at least some hope, while in

the 20th, parasitic Jewish monetary rule destroyed all hope and gradually began to rob the US of any kind of future, even a bad one. The Olilmigration, the people from northwestern Europe who built America and did 95 percent of the work that was done in the US until 1895 - and this despite the predations of the Astors, Vanderbilts and Rockefellers - they now had to watch during the inflationary era as a stream of dark-skinned, They now had to watch a stream of dark-skinned, oriental-looking Jewish immigrants flood in during the inflationary era, hating everything that the better people of old America had upheld - especially Christianity - while being given all the carefully created special privileges and assistance that none of the other immigrants had received. Most of these late Jewish immigrants came with the grim intention of committing every conceivable plutocratic crime in order to take possession of everything created for the purposes of Judaism and turn it into a weapon for the destruction of the rest of the world.

All this was, in fact, the cunningly contrived Jewish B'nai B'rith mission to the United States and was the fate that world Jewry had intended for the supposedly mindless herd people of the Goyim, who, according to the Jews, were firstly stupid enough to work, and secondly too stupid to protect what they had earned from the locusts. It is a humiliating story, and all these aspects, these dangers and catastrophes-except the bond between Zionism and Bolshevism-were brought to light in that hot summer of 1909 in Was- hington, D. C., by Fighting Bob LaFrance. C. was recognized by Fighting Bob LaFollette. The latter vainly warned his colleagues - the majority of whom were still the corrupt tools of the plutocracy - of the inevitable, dire consequences if the scandalous A ldrich Tariff! were to pass. As usual - even in defeat - Bob was an almost infallible prophet, but above all he was the man of action who knew that ideas have consequences - but only if they are linked to a practical program: then they have a future, or at least deserve one.

No sooner had the tariff battle been lost in August 1909 and it had become clear that even a newly elected Congress in 1910 would hardly be able to reverse the outcome of the battle - according to the American constitution, only one third of the senators were newly elected at each congressional election - than Bob went on a new, tangible speaking tour through the far west of the USA. It was fortunate that on this trip he was able to gather important evidence of how conservation was being disregarded by the plutocratic evildoers. In 1910, Taft dropped Pinchot's conservation program at the behest of these plutocrats, even though Teddy Roosevelt wanted to endorse it 1st 6. Thanks to the conservation issue, Bob was now able to demonstrate to even the most obtuse US citizens in the course of 1910 that Taft himself was a self-centered evildoer, devoid of any social conscience and concerned solely with the worship of money and those who possessed it - including world Jewry. He was now no longer just the figure

of fun at the time of his inauguration-he had become the consummate disgrace as President of the United States.

It can come as no surprise that in 1913, when Charles Beard's massive opus¹⁰⁷ on the fraud surrounding the creation of the US Constitution was published, Taft condemned this scholarly work and Beard personally - and in fierce and undignified language that was highly inappropriate for a national leader. Teddy Roosevelt and Woody Wilson also vilified Beard for his independent and honest scholarship. Needless to say, Bob La- Follette's own assiduous research into the past quarter-century of American national development had also given him a fair, honest, and objective perspective that was incomprehensible to narrow-minded tools of the American plutocracy in the mold of Bill Taft, Teddy Roosevelt, and Woody Wilson (and Frank Roosevelt, who was active in Wilson's 1912 presidential campaign). Wilson's own verbose and florid five volumes on U.S. history lack all originality and basic research and could easily have been turned into a single short essay. Teddy Roosevelt's so-called historical survey "The Winning of the West" is chauvinistic nonsense, and for an insight into the childish immaturity of Teddy's mind one need only consult "The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt 1868-1919"¹⁰⁸. Bob kept pace with Beard's foresight and scientific acumen in 1913 - but Taft, Wilson and the two Roosevelts did not.

Taft showed in 1911 that he was not afraid to use the presidential veto, which the Constitution of 1789 granted him, but which President Andrew Jackson had first used in 1829. In 1911, the US Congress voted to abrogate the trade treaty between the US and Tsarist Russia as part of a worldwide Jewish effort to destroy Tsarism and Christianity in Russia. Taft had propagated "dollar diplomacy" and "large American trade surpluses to reduce the debt burden of the USA to Europe" and now emphasized that the USA exported twice as much to Russia as it received from there. His veto was therefore motivated purely by economic considerations and not by considerations of principle. However, this veto did not have the same effect on the issue of trade with Russia as it would have had on the Aldrich tariff bill, where the Senate majority was only 16 votes. Jewish control of the American Congress was already so overwhelming that a two-thirds majority was quickly achieved and the treaty termination came into force despite Taft's veto. The American diplomats in St. Petersburg were left with the unpleasant task of explaining to Deputy Foreign Minister Neratov that the USA was only imposing its trade boycott on Russia in peacetime for the sake of the Jews. This was particularly unpleasant for the Russians, as just a few weeks earlier Russian Prime Minister Stolypin, by far the most capable Russian statesman of the 20th century, had been murdered by a Jewish terrorist in the Kiev Opera House.

In the meantime, Bob and his friends had clearly won all state and local elections in Wisconsin in November 1910, and Bob's friend Hiram Johnson did the same in California. Franklin Hiebborn (Stanford University), the best scientific political expert on California, pointed out that for the first time since the adoption of California's second constitution (1879), reformist elements were in charge in the state capital Sacramento and the way was clear to realize the Wisconsin utopia at the Golden Gate. The last vestiges of evil Jewish credit-mobilier corruption in California politics - the Southern Pacific Railroad and the remnants of the disgusting old Stanford-Huntington-Hopkins-Crocker gang - were out of the way. The mood of all America was captured in Hiram Johnson's telegram to Fighting Bob: "It was you who inspired us. "109 The Progressives were also in the saddle in Iowa, and their leader Jonathan Dolliver aptly described Bob's wrestling as the most important fight that had ever taken place in American politicalstello.

It is outrageous that a single mentally immature scoundrel like Teddy Roosevelt was able to block Bob's progress in 1912, and that another scoundrel, Woody Wilson, was able to turn this most promising situation in all of American history into the worst possible mess in seven short years.

Even more astonishing is the fact that thirteen years after Wilson's^g icy derangement (1919) Franklin Roosevelt came to power to surpass even his unscrupulous master Wilson in terrible crimes against humanity. The world was ruined when Frank Roosevelt died at the age of 63 in April 1945 in the arms of one of his mistresses. It was a terrible decline and fall within 35 years. Thelen did not exaggerate LaFollette's outlook just before Teddy's betrayal when he wrote: "The future of the rebellion seemed unlimited after the 1910 election.

Thelen also correctly notes that Bob's successful rebellion gave American voters freedom from the dictates of their hostile establishment for the very first time. "2^ When he returned to Washington, D. C., on December 3, 1910, after his dazzling one hundred percent victory in Wisconsin, he knew that his victorious progressives from coast to coast were counting on him to unify the United States and finally begin the great work of Reconstruction that began with the end of England. C., he knew that his victorious progressives from coast to coast were counting on him to unify the United States and finally begin the great work of reconstruction that should have begun with the end of English mercantilist rule five generations earlier, in 1789, but never did.

Somewhat unworldly in this context must be Thelen's remark that Bob was unduly concerned about finances for the upcoming 1912 campaign and was "constantly haunted by financial anxieties. Other presidential candidates - susceptible to corrupting influences of every kind, as they all were, including Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln - merely needed to sell their favors to the plutocratic oligarchy and already had all the money they needed for their campaigns. Bob's situation was very different, and Thelen showed himself to be astonishingly slow on the uptake - even for a court historian - in not recognizing that difference.

"Every man has his price" does not apply to the decent man. He cannot sell his favor for personal gain in the manner of Teddy Roosevelt, Woody Wilson or Frank Roosevelt. Bob had personally experienced how his opponents sought to destroy him through the most reprehensible means including murder. The USA in Bob's day was as corrupt as any country in world history, not excluding the late Roman Empire. It was a commonplace throughout the world that the chief characteristic of the American was the blind

worship of money. The average American sincerely hoped LaFollette would lead him to a state of true freedom for the first time, but until that happened, he himself was dominated by the same crass materialism as ever. Bob recognized this as clearly as John Adams had expressed it five generations earlier. Thelen alone does not see it.

If Americans had not always been susceptible to the blind, uncritical worship of Mammon, for example, the press people would not have dared to whitewash such despicable figures as J. P. Morgan and John D. Rockefeller Sr. again and again over the years. The only reason they were so often forgiven, while their crimes cried out to heaven, was that they were so filthy rich.

The candidacy of the reformer

Bob's next major task was to see to the 1912 presidential election: to see that the wishes of the American people were honored, and that the election itself would be clean and fair. It was a daunting task, and Bob's inspectors incurred expenses. There had never been a decent American presidential election. As a special oversight body, Bob created the National Progressive Republican League on January 21, 1911. Soon it had representatives in every state. Bob also met many times with the astute Henry U'ren of Oregon and worked with him to devise programs to advance the universal adoption of the primary election system¹¹⁶ that would ensure an honest selection of political candidates. Also discussed with U'ren was the referendum, which was to lead to a direct plebiscite in cases of corrupt legislation, and the so-called recall, which provided for extraordinary

elections in cases where previous referendums had called for the replacement of corrupt officials^m ^ Teddy Roosevelt, who had profited from corrupt politics^h atte, declared these elaborate schemes superfluous, but Bob^{kann} te Teddy only too well: Teddy was a weather vane without any h^{ce} firm principles under a cloak of chauvinism, and^{er} äⁿ changed his mind when it became apparent that Bob's election preparation enjoyed massive popular support^{^^}

L^a Follette dominated the entire session of the Senate, which ended on August ²², 1911. Two days earlier, Bob submitted a bill that would show the American people where he would begin his work as president if elected the following year. The bill provided for the right of the state to regulate American financial, industrial and commercial corporations and to inspect their books. Had this bill become law - which never happened - it would have made impossible, for example, the often illegal secret financing of the Anglo-French war effort after 1914 by Morgan and Rockefeller[^]

If one studies the American mass media nationwide in September 1911, one encounters the consensus view that the 1912 Republican Party convention would become solely a battle between the incumbent Big Lub and Bob LaFollette; furthermore, that Bob would win this convention contest-and that he would then, without undue difficulty, defeat the badly divided Democratic Party, in which the reactionaries were about equal in strength to the reformist elements. The Democrats had won their last presidential election in 1892, when Grover Cleveland won his second and final term after losing in the 1888 election. Cleveland was the only Democrat in the White House since Abe Lincoln's disastrous 1860 campaign had helped trigger the Civil War. Like Wilson in 1912, Lincoln had received only 38 percent of the popular vote in 1860, but won the election because his opponents, Whigs and Democrats, were divided - and likewise, Wilson now won thanks to the Republican split.

The malefactors of great wealth in America had never allowed the articulation of what Rousseau had called the general will. The two main purposes of the 1789 OS Constitution (still in existence today) were to strengthen the central police power against the outraged taxpayers and to prevent the expression of the general will in the USA. These miscreants were once again masquerading as patriots when they set out in 1912 to prevent the realization of freedom in the United States. As the Englishman Dr. Samuel Johnson had so aptly observed five generations earlier, patriotism is always the last refuge of scoundrels-of which John D. Rockefeller in 1912 and Richard M. Nixon in 1972 are good examples. Johnson himself was a true and good English patriot who had something against scoundrels for whom patriotism served only to conceal their crimes.

The oligarchy makes its preparations

As it turned out, in 1912 the evildoers had two reliable men - and they only needed two - of sufficient stature to destroy America's hope: Teddy Roosevelt and Woody Wilson. If they had needed four, they would have gotten four. There was not the slightest danger that Teddy or Woody could ever become decent. Teddy's job was to thwart LaFollette's candidacy, and Wilson was to snatch the presidency in the ensuing mess and ensure that clean federal government would never become a reality in the United States. As all the world recognizes today, decency never took hold in the White House, not to mention the eternally corrupt US Congress and the phony and dishonorable Supreme Court.

Political crime has always ruled in Washington. And it continues to rule there, more crudely, more cynically and more crassly than ever before. Seen from this broader perspective, the 1912 victory of the wrongdoers was a slippery one. This outcome was uncertain for the people, but not doubtful for the American plutocratic oligarchy. One thinks of the time in 1939 when Lord Halifax unleashed the Second World War. Back then, the German people expected Hitler to win because they knew his cause was just and imagined he had loyal helpers. Although the traditional German treasonous elite worried that Hitler might win despite all their efforts, their strong bulwarks in the Reichsbank, the Foreign Office, the Army Command and the Abwehr remained as secret trump cards in their quest to crush Hitler's greatness as well as Germany's. They had the same advantages of connivance as Germany. They had the same advantages of being in on Hitler as the American miscreants had over LaFollette in 1912. The result was the same in both cases, however different the external circumstances may have been: The American people were defeated in 1912, the German people in 1945. The American Pluto-Oligarchie triumphed in 1912, the traditional German treasonous elite in 1945.

Bob LaFollette in 1912 resembled a great, clean-cut boxer wearing regulation 8-ounce gloves against a sneaky judo karate specialist and his free killer hands.

He wrote his autobiography¹²⁰ in the fall of 1911. The *American Magazine* gave him a generous fee for the right to print the book in installments. The 12,000 dollars of that time were comparable to 150,000 soft dollars a few generations later. Bob's report appeared in twelve successive weekly installments before it was published as a complete book in Madison, Wisconsin in late 1911. Although Thelen claims otherwise, LaFollette's autobiography - like Hitler's "Mein Kampf" - contains very little embellishment. These men were not exhibitionists of the kind of Jean Jacques Rousseau, whose strange Confessions were published posthumously in Paris in 1782, or Giacomo Casanova, whose multi-volume memoirs were also published after his death in 1798. No fewer attacks were written against the autobiographies of LaFollette and Hitler than against the two men themselves, but these attacks were devoid of serious substance.

Bob's book, like Hitler's, was weighty and took time to be popularly received. Its publication may have had little impact on the growth of Bob's popularity, which was already enormous in 1912. As with Hitler, it was La- Follette's speeches that spontaneously electrified the masses. They were both popular, but how widely they were really understood in their respective countries is a matter for endless speculation. Neither of them is likely to have been really well understood, otherwise they would not have fallen into oblivion so quickly. There is every indication that Mussolini was better understood in Italy than Bob ever was in the USA or Hitler in Germany. Whether this has its cause in some special quality of Mussolini is not certain. Italians have always understood language better than Englishmen, Germans or Americans.

Opening of the 1912 election campaign; Roosevelt's betrayal

Teddy could bide his time for the attack on Bob, for the latter did not begin his campaign until after Christmas 1911, and that was very late to fend off Teddy's treachery when it became known^^ LaFollette's success in federal politics reached its absolute zenith with his speech at Carnegie Hall in New York City on January 22, 1912. Almost the entire city police force was there to hold back the tens of thousands who could not gain admittance. Bob immediately made sizzling contact with his audience and never lost it until the end. He pushed aside his prepared speech and spoke freely. The New York Times of January 23, 1912, wrote that "Carnegie Hall has never had a larger and more enthusiastic audience"123.

It was during a late dinner after that speech that Bob first learned that a few miles away, on his princely estate in Oyster Bay/Long Island, Teddy Roosevelt had decided to break all his 1904 promises to the American people. The man who had styled himself the Rough Rider as overcompensation for a sterile, coddled East Coast youth (later Republican boss Mark Hanna, by contrast, called him only "that damned cowboy"), publicly declared his candidacy for the 1912 Republican nomination - and so Big Lub in the White House finally learned why he himself, and not Elihu Root, had been chosen in 1908 for the thankless and lackluster business of Teddy's successor.

When Bob returned to Washington, D.C., for a meeting of the National Progressive Republican League, conservationist Gifford Pinchot, who owed Bob a great deal, backed by wealthy Chicago publisher McCormick, urged him to withdraw his own presidential candidacy in favor of Teddy. Thanks to the zeal of the corrupt media, Pinchot's demand made national headlines within hours and quickly became an avalanche. Bob's first reaction was to refuse to withdraw his candidacy and to calmly and firmly declare that the men who demanded he

do so were traitors to the American Progressive movement - and they were at Tatt24.

Those days in early 1912-and not the ones after the temporary 1908 election setback in Wisconsin-were the worst yet for Bob. And then the usual and expected major smear happened-one that will forever remain a thick stain on the dirty shield of American journalism. This one took the bigger hit than LaFollette. Bob had committed to speaking at the annual banquet of the American Association of Newspaper and Magazine Publishers on February 2. The day before, he learned that his daughter Mary was to have surgery on the morning of February 3. Thelen insists it was Bob's fault for not canceling his speech the night before the surgery. This typical example of a smug court historian who would have advised the victim of an impending great calumny to disappear for a while, to crawl under a rock, is reminiscent of the anecdote Abe Lincoln told to a gathering of American journalists in Springfield, Illinois: Riding through the woods, he met a lovely lady who came up to him in a side saddle and exclaimed: "You are the ugliest man I have ever seen! To his reply that he couldn't help it, she replied vehemently: "Then at least stay at home!

Bob entered the hall in Philadelphia at 11 pm, just as Woody Wilson, Governor of New Jersey, was finishing a dignified, meaningless speech to a bored audience¹²⁵. Bob had not eaten all day out of concern for Mary's health and had only taken a sip of whiskey. It was not alcohol intoxication but genuine outrage that prompted Bob's remarks to the corrupt, venal representatives of the American media in Philadelphia on February 2, 1912. If one wanted to find an analogy to explain Bob's situation, Hitler's second indignant speech to the German Reichstag on that day in March 1933, when the Enabling Act was passed, giving Hitler extraordinary powers for four years to fight the German economic crisis that had ruined Germany's farmers and miners and left fully half of Germany's industrial workforce unemployed, would be the most appropriate. Otto Wels, the spokesman for the Marxist Social Democratic faction of the Reichstag, which voted against the Enabling Act to the last man, had the audacity to claim that his party disagreed with Hitler on domestic policy but welcomed his foreign policy. The reality was very different, as the Social Democrats had publicly denounced every foreign policy proposal made by Hitler over the previous 15 years, ever since the German people had been deceived and crushed by Wilson's infamous Treaty of Versailles. Hitler's second speech - like LaFollette's 21 years earlier in Philadelphia - was completely spontaneous and off the cuff, even if it reads in Schulthess' European History Calendar of 1933 like the most carefully honed and thought-out speech imaginable.

When the Marxist Reichstag deputies tried to drown out the words of the Reich Chancellor in the same way they had done countless times with the

Imperial Chancellor Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg¹²⁶, the robust Hermann Göring, Reichstag President since 1932, thunderously called them to order: "Quiet! The Führer is settling accounts!" But Hitler was by no means ungentlemanly or vindictive in his so-called reckoning: there was no discrimination against the Marxist members of the Reichstag because they had voted against him after January 30, 1933, the day Hitler came to power in accordance with the constitution. For example, Paul Löbe, 14 years older than Hitler and outliving him by many years, joined Göring's

Löbe's predecessor as Reichstag President until 1932, voluntarily resigned after he and the other Marxist MPs voted against the Enabling Act, which gave Hitler the opportunity to cure the German economic crisis fabricated in the USA once and for all. Löbe received every penny of his full pension until Hitler's death on April 30, 1945. Under his Marxist brother Stalin, a vote like the one against Hitler would have cost Löbe his head, and in 1934 the German Communist leader Ernst Thälmann, when complaining to Göring about the meagre conditions of his prison stay, freely admitted that in the opposite case he would have immediately laid Göring's head at his feet. Hitler's only intention in his second speech was - like Bob in Philadelphia 21 years earlier - to set the record straight on the basis of the facts. This was already expressed in Hitler's opening statement of genuine astonishment: "Late you come, but you come!" In other words: After fourteen years of the bitterest and worst persecution, in some cases with Hitler banned from speaking, the Social Democrats - the masters of Prussia from the failure of the Kapp Putsch (1920) to von Papen's chancellorship (1932) and, on top of that, the strongest party in the Reichstag from 1912 to 1932 - now suddenly latched on to Hitler's foreign policy, and did so with the greatest naturalness. Of course, this only proved once again what Hitler had already known for 25 years, namely that all disciples of Karl Marx, whichever of the five Marxist Internationals they belonged to, were world champions in lying. The old German proverb says it aptly: Like master, like servant^^

The stab in the back against America's great hope

In 1912, in LaFollette's case - as with Hitler 21 years later - the target sat comfortably in front of him. Instead of the lying Social Democrats, it was the corrupt American press, mere playthings in the hands of the plutocratic evildoers. In fact, it is no exaggeration to say that the American press that attacked Bob and the Social Democrats that attacked Hitler were tools of the same international conspiracy, namely world Jewry in the guise of the allied wings of its global offensive, Bolshevism and Zionism. Bob also gave a

completely spontaneous speech, and after he had spoken for two hours, there was certainly not a single bored person in the room. Admittedly, in the trial by fire of those days of Teddy's betrayal, Bob did engage in some personal attacks of the sort that had always characterized American party politics. After all, he was Fighting Bob and not the genteel Woody Wilson of Princeton or the anemic scholar from Northwestern University portrayed in a best-selling novel of the day

The American media reacted to Bob's justifiable attack with the childish fury of the spoiled little boy caught by the maid with his hand in mother's forbidden cookie jar. The American press had already been completely ruined by the plutocratic miscreants by 1912^^ Few historians of American journalism would disagree with Professor Desmond, former head of the Berkeley School of Journalism at the University of California, who said in conversation with the author that American journalism was never as good after the Civil War as it once was in the more individualistic 1840s and 1850s, before the plutocratic miscreants devoted so much time and attention to it.

A myriad of East Coast newspapers claimed in the days following LaFollette's speech in Philadelphia that Fighting Bob had gone insane. More forgiving papers elsewhere were content with the unsubstantiated and mendacious claim that Bob had suffered a temporary nervous breakdown. Both claims were pure nonsense. None of the words Bob had directed at the journalistic lackeys of the American plutocracy had been undeserved. Apart from that, however, these savage press smears were mere annoying flies to Bob compared to the factual effects of Teddy's subhuman treachery.

Although Bob retained the nationwide allegiance of true progressives throughout 1912 and until his death in 1925, it was only natural for the practical politician in Bob that all too many confused, lukewarm and half-educated fellow travelers of progressivism would now be scared away by the corrupt media and herded into supporting the glamorous Teddy, the legendary hero of San Juan Hili, Cuba in 1898. Bob's reaction was characteristic: he immediately dropped his attacks on Taft and turned fully against Teddy, dooming his third presidential bid once and for all. Whenever Bob mentioned Teddy in later speeches in 1912 - and this happened very often - he contemptuously dismissed him as the lying "bluffer" 130. No one was able to prove more quickly and easily than Bob that Teddy was a reactionary in disguise.

Public antipathy toward Teddy became so intense that when he came to Wisconsin to senselessly and boastfully ditch Bob back home, he

received a flesh wound from a bullet in Milwaukee before he had even taken the rostrum \ⁿ

Hitler's reaction would probably have been very similar had he not succeeded in stifling Gregor Strasser's second treasonous act against him as leader of German National Socialism at the last minute in 1932.

Certainly today it is not difficult to curse the stupidity of the American voters of 1912, but at that time everything printed in the press was still widely believed to be true, and the evildoers poured huge sums into the campaign to further denigrate Bob and glorify Teddy. This was a very wise investment in their interests. Teddy had proven during his nearly eight years in the presidency that he would never challenge the plutocrats, whereas it was safe to assume that Bob, given only four years by the people, would break the dictatorial grip of the plutocrats at least for a time, if not forever.

About the only spin Woody Wilson thought he could use to prove he was a progressive like LaFollette after his inauguration in 1913-when progressivism was still having its heyday-was his inherited prejudice of being from the American South against any kind of protective tariff. So he could attack and eliminate the hated Aldrich Tariff! - which was undoubtedly what progressives wanted - without actually breaking with his own reactionary past. In addition to his Confederate-Southern background, Wilson was throughout his life what Thomas Jefferson would have called a hopeless "Anglomaniac" 132 a century earlier. Carelessly, in 1913, he revealed to a reporter from the Hearst press that the first newspaper he read each day was not an American one, but the London Times - and this revelation was not exactly commented on kindly in the wide-ranging Hearst press. Because his English political mentor Walter Bagehot and England as a whole were still in favor of international free trade in 1913, it was not a personal ideological sacrifice for Woody in the White House to steer US tariff policy away from protectionism and towards moderate tariffs as government revenue alone.

Wilson and Henry Morgenthau Sr.

Among countless other wealthy Jews, Henry Morgenthau Sr. had personally made a huge financial contribution to Wilson's successful presidential bid in 1912. As a reward, Morgenthau demanded the American ambassadorship at the Court of St. James (i.e., in London), but Wilson feared that Morgenthau, like other conservative German-American Jews who were neither Bolshevik (like the wealthy Boston soap manufacturer Joseph Fels) nor Zionist (like the wealthy Kentucky

lawyer Louis Brandeis), might lean toward Germany rather than England and thus hinder the Anglophile foreign policy Wilson intended to pursue. Although his son Henry Morgenthau Jr. - Frank Roosevelt's Secretary of the Treasury for four terms - eagerly embraced Bolshevism, and Morgenthau Sr. occasionally acquiesced to Zionist threats during the First World War and served Zionist interests even when they ran counter to US policy, his relative political independence was a source of concern and unease for Wilson, who in addition to supporting the British Empire also intended to support global Bolshevism and Zionism from the outset. But because Morgenthau Sr. had contributed more cash to Wilson's campaign than any other Jew, he had to be rewarded, and so Wilson wanted to please him by appointing him American envoy to Istanbul (Ottoman Empire). Although this post would have delighted most Zionist Jews-they wanted to take over Palestine, which was still under Ottoman suzerainty-Morgenthau Sr, not a Zionist, was angered by what he saw as a demeaning appointment and did not forgive Wilson for several years.

In the meantime, Wilson had chosen his friend Walter Hines Page, a journalist from the southern states, for the London post, whose Anglomania, as far as Wilson knew, went so far that he felt primarily loyal not to the USA but to England. In this respect Wilson and Page were ideological twins, and in American domestic politics they were both reactionaries. Page hid all his real feelings and views when he appeared before the US Senate seeking confirmation of his appointment. After all, Wilson in the White House was engaged in the same deception. Sir Edward Grey in London was thrilled to have such an American ambassador and stepped up his efforts to unleash World War I with the admitted intention - which he shared with Eyre Crowe, the Permanent Secretary of Foreign Affairs - of destroying and dismembering the Bismarckian German Empire. Grey's efforts in this direction had failed in 1909 and 1911¹³³ but were crowned with success in 1914 - barely fifteen months after Page's arrival in London. Page was supposed to represent the USA, but in reality - like Wilson - he thought of England first. As a result, Page often wrote British reply notes to the USA for Grey, not because he was the smarter one, but because as a journalist he had a better understanding of the American psyche and the American propaganda scene. Ordinary officials in the American State Department marveled at Grey's knowledge, while in reality Page had written Grey's diplomatic correspondence. Needless to say, Page's extra-legal activity had Wilson's full approval - just as Frank Roosevelt was quite happy to receive messages from Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty,

behind British Prime Minister Chamberlain's back in 1939-1940. Churchill's activity was pure treason under current British law, no different from Page's activity under American law, but both Woody Wilson and his disciple Frank Roosevelt - who incidentally became Under-Secretary of State for the Navy in 1913 - were outright political criminals who personally never had the slightest regard for the law.

Wilson achieved some tariff reform before the end of 1913 in the form of the new Underwood Tariff! which replaced the ^{Alrich} Tariff! and actually reduced tariffs somewhat. Then Wilson wanted the people to believe that the infamous Federal Reserve Banking System - which he and Virginia Senator Glass had pushed through Congress with the help of huge Jewish lob-byist funds - was also a so-called progressive measure, when in fact - as Charles Lindbergh Sr. made clear in his book - it was diametrically opposed to everything that progressivism advocated. Wilson had also loudly promised reform of the US civil service during his 1912 election campaign. But Albert Burleson - unclean friend of Edward Mandeli House from Texas and appointed post-master general by Wilson, responsible for the entire office patronage of the Democrats - this Burleson was easily able to persuade Wilson after winning the election that a reform of the civil service was not feasible. Only 8 percent of federal administrative positions were filled in 1913 based on comparative merit reviews, the rest were simply given to incompetent, corrupt cronies of the ruling plutocratic politicians. Had LaFollette been elected in 1912, the merit system would have been instituted for the entire federal bureaucracy, but Burleson, the corrupt Texan, was able to convince a willing Wilson in the course of a single brief meeting that reform was not possible. The American people had caught themselves in their own trap by electing the hypocritical scoundrel Wilson - and the worst was yet to come: Not only did Wilson continue throughout his presidency to inflict one outrageous injustice after another on the United States, from 1913 onward he additionally began destroying the world outside¹³⁴.

The false official image of Wilson in the USA

In early 1914 he confided to House that he did not know how he could continue to maintain the progressive pose, and no doubt his deception would have become apparent before the end of that year had not Sir Edward Grey managed to trigger the First World War in August 1914. In the meantime, LaFollette's own independent research had revealed (as

Thelen rightly confirms) that Wilson was anything but a progressive, rather a helpless puppet in the hands of the Morgan, Rockefeilers and Jewish plutocrats^^

When Bob read out the list of Wilson's appointments to the newly created Federal Reserve Board and its twelve regional offices in the US Senate in 1914, every senator - whether pro-Wilson or pro-Clark, Democrat or Republican - had to admit that it would have been pointless to defend Wilson against the accusation of Teddy-like subservience to the big financial corporations. Hence, no such defense of Wilson against Bob's charges of financial corruption has ever been attempted in the Senate.

Wilson stood naked as a hopelessly corrupt political reactionary-and this even before the outbreak of the First World War. Nevertheless, the American court historians, in collusion with the Jewish B'nai B'rith censorship, continue decade after decade to claim that Wilson was a true progressive in 1914 who had to postpone his program of immigration reform solely because of the outbreak of World War I in faraway Europe. The success of this desperately false and dishonest operation is explained by the general American contempt for the truth. A good example is the court historian Bernadotte Schmitt in Chicago. Within twelve months, his book on the outbreak of war in 1914¹³⁶ was exposed by American critics as a hoax containing deliberate distortions and omissions - just as German historians¹³⁷ uncovered lies in the ambitious four-volume justification work by the former imperial chancellor Bernhard von Bülow. This did not deter the American Historical Association from electing the venal scoundrel Schmitt as its president in 1962, nor did it prevent Fay's 1928 publisher, Macmillan, from marking the fiftieth anniversary of the outbreak of the First World War with Barbara Tuchman's book "The Guns of August "¹³⁸. This rabidly pro-Bolshevik Jewess - daughter of FDR's Henry Morgenthau Jr, the originator of the infamous Morgenthau Plan to decimate the German people - filled her wretched book with all the garbage of British WWI propaganda that had been challenged and publicly refuted decades earlier by the Tory MP Lord Ponsonby¹³⁹. Fay was as indignant about Macmillan shortly before his death in 1968 as Beard had been about Admiral H. E. Morison in his last days in 1948^

So, in the US, the corrupt media protects the dishonest historians while slandering and silencing the decent ones among them; unfortunately, there has been no exception to this iron rule for many years. And what is more, calling Wilson a progressive is just another way of showing hatred and disgust for real progressivism. The Moscow

Bolshaya Sovetskaya Enziklo- pediya of 1940, for example, also claimed that Switzerland was fascist, Germany totalitarian and the Soviet Union democratic. The ideological environmental scene has obviously been similar in the USA and the USSR for years, and the techniques of distortion and misrepresentation are the same here as there. In the Orwellian language of Big Brother, in America as in the USSR, truth is a lie, and peace is war. Orwell demanded that his book "1984" should be entitled "1948", but his publisher in London insisted on the last two digits being reversed for reasons of self-preservation.

The battle continues:

LaFollette advocates genuine neutrality for the USA in the Senate

For LaFollette, a few days after the outbreak of the First World War, it was clear that Wilson not only expected England to win, but also demanded that the USA should help bring it about. During the first month of the war, Wilson ignored the objections of his own Secretary of State Bryan and publicly insisted on the fictitious right of Americans to travel on ships of belligerent England under official U.S. protection. Wilson also asserted an alleged right of plutocratic evildoers from American high finance to turn the US into the main supply arsenal for a protracted Anglo-French war of attrition and bleeding against the peoples of the Central Powers. It was clear to Bob from the outset that Germany had the most to offer in scientific technology and cultural achievement of any belligerent in the world, and he recognized as well that unnecessary U.S. intervention in this war would only destroy the country's only chance so far to reform its own corrupt and decrepit institutions and introduce decency and realism into U.S. public life for the first time. Bob's assessment of Germany's unique contribution to the modern world was confirmed by Arnold Toynbee,¹⁴ who, as an English historian during England's war against Germany, declared that Europe's culture and civilization suffered their greatest losses in the German trenches. Toynbee was later taken in hand during the war by Lord Northcliffe, the British chief propagandist, and wrote servile war propaganda tracts against Germany in 1917¹⁴².

Bob strained to maintain his leadership role in the US Senate during the period of world war hysteria, and at the time of American pseudo-neutrality, 1914-1917, Bob's speeches hit Wilson hard for any violation of the legal requirements of genuine neutrality. After October 1914, it was clear that the war could remain undecided for a long time, not so much because of Germany's temporary strategic setback at the Marne, but because of the unlawful British starvation blockade and the

unauthorized American financing of the Anglo-French war effort.

Despite the fact that Woody Wilson began to express strong disapproval of Bob's work in the U.S. Senate, Bob did not bother to build a campaign organization for his re-election in 1916 in order to continue as Wisconsin's senator for six years. And yet he held his own with an ample 65 percent majority, while Wilson only just edged ahead of Charles Evans Hughes in that year's presidential race despite his extensive and costly campaign organization^w. Wilson achieved this narrow result despite the fact that Hughes was a miserable campaigner whose political reputation was largely confined to the state of New York. All in all, Hughes was a far weaker candidate than Judge Alton Parker, whom Teddy Roosevelt had defeated easily and by a wide margin in 1904. Had Hughes not unnecessarily attacked Bob's friend Hiram Johnson during his 1916 election trip through California, causing him to switch camps and take California to Wilson, the latter would never have been re-elected. Hughes was a hopeless reactionary like Wilson and committed to the same plutocratic interests - facts that led Bob to strict neutrality towards both unworthy candidates, but the American electorate to a broad protest vote for a third party, the USA Socialist Party. This, in turn, turned Wilson against Eugene Debs, the Socialist presidential candidate, and he did not rest until he had Debs sent to the huge concentration camp-like prison in Atlanta, Georgia, on completely false and trumped-up charges. The harmless, friendly Debs was left to rot in prison for years until Wilson's successor, Harding, granted him amnesty. Nevertheless, in 1916 - as in 1912 - the vengeful psychopath Wilson again failed to win the majority of votes cast in the presidential election. His worst electoral fiasco came on November 5, 1918, while the First World War was still raging. Wilson had called on the American people again and again in 1918 to give him a large Democratic majority in Congress and thus strengthen his influence if he went to France to negotiate peace. The voters responded by rejecting Wilson's candidate and electing a vastly outnumbered Republican Congress. Thanks to this fiasco, Wilson was treated in Paris by Lloyd George, Clemenceau and Orlando as he deserved, namely as an untrustworthy leader rejected by his own voters. Wilson never succeeded in becoming as popular as Fighting Bob had been for fifteen years until the USA entered the war - and especially in 1916, as Thelen recalls, "more than ever before" ⁴.

William Jennings Bryan had also been a Democratic Party celebrity for many years after his famous cross-of-gold speech at the 1896 Democratic convention. He had correctly observed that the American plutocratic evildoers were busily putting all mankind on a cross of gold. Then, in 1912, Bryan had made the mistake of supporting Wilson for the nomination instead of Champ Clark of Missouri. Wilson forced Bryan to resign as Secretary of State in 1915. Bryan had dared to say publicly that he objected to Wilson's dishonorable policy of holding Germany strictly accountable while tolerating an ever-growing list of British crimes against international law and humanity. In October 1914, an illegal and legally impossible British starvation blockade of Central Europe had been imposed by Cabinet order. Bryan could not remain silent in the face of Wilson's own law-breaking and his acceptance of British international crimes. Bryan was replaced in Wilson's cabinet by Robert Lansing, who was totally corrupt and an Anglomaniac. Bryan gave speeches up and down the country against Wilson's policy, but made a strategic blunder that LaFollette would not have made: in order to win over the patriots among his audience, he carelessly assured them that if the USA actually went to war, he would stand behind Wilson, regardless of how this entry into the war came about. This fatal concession only strengthened Wilson's determination to plunge the US into war as quickly as possible in order to silence Bryan's ongoing criticism.

Wilson's only reason for holding back a little until he had the 1916 election victory in the bag was his - and his Jewish advisors' - realization that a failed attempt to get the declaration of war before the election would have ended his own political career. In his five-volume history of the United States, Wilson had criticized President Madison for leading his country into war against England in 1812, even though it was politically divided. In retrospect, while it is easy to conclude that the German media was wrong to favor Wilson over Hughes in 1916, it must be said that the latter was also corrupt and, if elected, would have obeyed the orders of the American Pluto oligarchy and taken the country to war to protect Morgan-Rockefeller investments in England and France. This suspicion was confirmed by the Nye Committee of the US Senate, which in 1934 - twenty years after the outbreak of the First World War - investigated the causes of the unnecessary participation of the USA in this war.

As usual, American voters had no real choice in 1916. The corrupt candidates were put on the shields by the malefactors at two corrupt party conventions. LaFollette's movement in favor of a general primary election system had been halted by Teddy's 1912 treachery, and so the

constitutional expert and political observer M. I. Ostrogorski¹⁴⁵ undoubtedly spoke the truth when he remarked that American citizens had no more say in the question of which presidents should govern them than the subjects of European monarchies had in the question of which princes would rule over them.

The situation in the USA was even worse, because the Yankee presidents had an enormous amount of power, while the European princes were more representative figures. Hegel, for example, called the King of Prussia the "dot on the i". King of Prussia and thus also German Emperor in 1914 was the educated and highly intelligent Wilhelm III, and there is much to be said in favor of the thesis that if only he had possessed the real power of the Great Elector of Brandenburg in the 17th century, instead of being ignored and pushed around by inferior political figures such as Caprivi, Hohenlohe, Bülow and Bethmann-Hollweg, he might have escaped the trap set for Germany by the British Foreign Secretary Grey. On the other hand, England would have been quickly ruined if such incompetent Hanoverian-English sovereigns as Queen Victoria (1837-1901) or George V (1914-1935) had possessed actual power.

Wilson supports British imperialism

But the leading critic of Wilson's foreign policy until 1917 was not Bryan, the man who had mistakenly served Wilson in the Cabinet before he saw clearly and had made the mistake of publicly declaring that he would do so again under certain circumstances (which was all the more foolish since Wilson, who never forgave, would never have accepted Bryan's services). Rather, the leading critic of Wilson was Fighting Bob, the senator from Wisconsin, equally adept at foreign and domestic policy. He was the enlightened leader who had already seen through the hopelessness of Wilson's corruption before the British imperialists unleashed the First World War⁴⁶.

It had been clear to Bob for years that the US - who figured in English political jokes not as Uncle Sam but as the unruly little cousin Jonathan - was guided in its foreign policy by the steadfast Anglomaniacs of the plutocratic East Coast oligarchy. These misanthropes were intoxicated by the conquests and military successes of British imperialism and wished to support and emulate it. Bob had always recognized that for the average American in his unequal struggle against the dictatorship of the Pluto oligarchs, his ignorance of American institutions and domestic

problems was a tremendous handicap. But this widespread ignorance of domestic American conditions was still superior knowledge compared to the abysmal, total ignorance of the world outside the US. The evil-doers who owned and controlled the mass media deliberately flooded the confused mind and stunted soul of the citizenry with filthy misinformation. A supremely typical example of this is the successful attempt by the wealthy Hungarian-American newspaper Jew Joseph Pulitzer to convince the citizenry after 1895 that the fifth-rate decrepit Spanish military force posed a mortal threat to the United States, that Spanish fleets could destroy the coastal cities of the United States, and that Spanish armies could advance across New Jersey to Kansas. This same nonsense was later rehashed by the American Jewish media for use against Germany during the two British wars of aggression against the German Second and Third Reichs - known as the First and Second World Wars - with the result that after the thousand-year First Reich, the Second lasted only 47 years and the Third only twelve. With the result, however, that millions of innocent Germans had to die because of this Jewish warmongering, and that the uncivilized American barbarian hordes became known as the scourge of Europe in the 20th century.

If the American public needed protection against mistreatment from the wrongdoers on the home front - and it did - that was still comparatively nothing, given an unleashed, politically powerful anglomaniac like Wilson and a Britain that had organized a powerful coalition against Germany in the first decade of the 20th century. De facto, this coalition comprised Great Britain, Russia, France, Japan, China, the USA as well as India, Canada, South Africa, Australia and other subjugated countries within the British Empire. The British Foreign Secretary Grey lied to the British public, the House of Commons and even his Cabinet colleagues in 1914 (which is why two of them, Burns and Morley, resigned in August 1914 despite the national emergency). Grey behaved exactly like his cousin Halifax 25 years later and, like him, had the support of the Permanent British Foreign Office, headed by Sir Eyre Crowe in 1914 and another German-hater, Sir Alexander Cadogan, in 1939.

Such was the terrible impact of "Perfidious Albion" on the world of the early 20th century, at the time when Bob LaFollette had serious reason to believe that Wilson had a permanent criminal mental disorder (while his actual mental illness did not become apparent to anyone in the USA until 1919, three years after his second presidential election victory). Wilson's cruel mistreatment of Mexico¹⁴⁷, which needlessly cost hundreds of thousands of lives, gave a scientific and unbiased observer like Bob reason to conclude that Wilson was a sadistic psychopath and incapable of rational behavior in foreign policy. Add to this Wilson's chronic and hopeless Anglomania - which he himself proclaimed to the Hearst press at a time when Britain was in the midst of the most brutal and

destructive war of all time - and LaFollette, the acknowledged guardian of the last shreds of American prestige, faced the greatest challenge of his life.

The appearance of Bernard Baruch

Things were not at all bad for him during the early months of the war when Bryan was Secretary of State and was constantly trying to mitigate Wilson's worst abuses and excesses. Bob, however, got no more help from the ranks of the federal executive after Bryan was removed from office by Wilson in 1915 and Robert Lansing, corrupt anglo-maniac and compliant tool of wrongdoers, was made his successor. But as if that wasn't bad enough, after the 1916 election victory, Bernard Baruch became Wilson's number one Jewish advisor - and Baruch was the most ambitious and cruel of all the Jews around Wilson. This was a challenge of the first order for Fighting Bob. In fact, no American politician had faced such a daunting task since the founding of the country in 1776¹⁴⁸.

It is essential to clarify Baruch's role in the years 1916-1919 in order to show what a frightening situation Bob found himself in. This role was not explained in Baruch's autobiography¹⁴⁹, which is nothing but a ghostwritten whitewash - like the memoirs of Stimson, Truman, Eisenhower and Hull - but in an earlier biography of Baruch, that of the brilliant South Carolina historian Margaret Coit¹⁵⁰, this role becomes clear.

Baruch was born in Camden, South Carolina in 1870, and Coit describes a visit by the young Woody Wilson in 1871 to nearby Columbia, the capital of South Carolina^{^^} Both Baruch and Wilson were the sons of men who had publicly declared their allegiance to the Thirteen Confederate States of America under President Jeff Davis during the bloody Civil War of 1861-1865. This was the valiant, unsuccessful military effort for freedom and for the kind of self-determination that had been the goal of the original Thirteen States against England's mercantilism and tyranny in 1776 - but the Union tyranny against which the South was fighting was worse than that of the English. Terrible conditions prevailed at the time of Reconstruction when young Wilson visited Columbia. For example, this city, which had never been in a combat zone, had been completely burned and destroyed by Union General Sherman in 1865, just as ancient Carthage had been destroyed by the Romans and Washington, D. C. by the English invaders. C. by the British invaders in 1814.

No one can say what terrible thoughts of revenge went through young Wilson's mind at the time. What we do know, however, is this: In Wilson's five-volume history of the United States, published more than thirty years later,¹⁵² when some of the North's hatred of the South had been tempered by the latter's leading role in the War of 1898 against Spain, Wilson harshly condemned the policies of Abe Lincoln and the North that would have provoked the terrible and unnecessary Civil War. Above all, Wilson rejected as an affront to the honor of the Southern people the view that the outbreak of that war had the slightest thing to do with the question of Negro slavery.

The revenge mentality of the American South

Wilson, like other and more imaginative Southern historians (notably the great Ulrich Phillips), insisted that Negro slaves in the old South were treated well and lived better and more comfortably than the poor among Southern whites or as white farm and factory workers in the North. The American movement for the abolition of slavery began in the South, where the benevolent planters were located, and not in the North, where the cruel slave traders were at home. The slave trade was dead by 1860, slave prices had become unaffordable, and at the same time the proportion of free Negroes in the South was growing rapidly, and so - not unlike in Brazil or Cuba, where slavery had ended without war - the days of slavery in the southern United States were numbered.

It was therefore not necessary to kill 600,000 soldiers, severely wound more than 100,000,000, and ravish hundreds of thousands of women of both races in the South in order to violently end an archaic, yet never inhumane, labor system that was dying a peaceful death. It was this very system of slavery from which the New England merchant class had profited immensely for nine generations. The military crackdown on the South was followed by fifteen years of terror under Occupation Martial Law and Reconstruction, creating a diseased and brutalized South. This was what Abe Lincoln had made of the most original and attractive system ever established on North American soil:

The old planter aristocracy that Lincoln had hated so much was destroyed. The remaining white population of the South was maltreated and tortured for fifteen years. The South became what it would forever remain: a misshapen animal without a head, full of blind rage and fury and hatred for all other people.

The above conclusion, once mere hypothesis, has been scientifically

proven by my former teacher and friend at Stanford University, Thomas Aldrich Bailey¹⁵³. When the last revolutionary crisis erupted in Spanish-ruled Cuba¹⁵⁴⁻¹⁸⁹⁵ - it was the South that led the other regions of the U.S. in its desire to harm Spain. Meanwhile, southern whites who had fled Reconstruction lived in indescribably primitive conditions in the Amazon basin of Brazil. When Wilson launched his mad, unprovoked three-year war without a declaration of war against Mexico¹⁵⁵ in 1913, it was again the South that led the way in its desire to harm Mexico. Even when England, unprovoked, unleashed World War I, it was the South that desired to use this foreign war as an excuse for the United States to harm Germany. And when President Frank Roosevelt, in his bellicose and hysterical Chicago Bridge speech of 1937, made it clear to even the most stodgy American that he personally wanted to wage a war of aggression against Germany, Italy and Japan together with the USSR and England, the South was immediately on hand again with the desire to harm, or even destroy, these venerable and civilized peoples of Europe and Asia.

Bailey had no difficulty in backing up his thesis, as his book was based on the most detailed research into all aspects of every opinion poll ever conducted in the United States. It was this seriously ill South that gave Woody Wilson and Frank Roosevelt the public opinion backing they needed for their many wars of aggression-wars that could find eager support only in a seriously ill society.

It was only poetic justice that this support for the warmongers backfired hardest on the South itself, which was forced to submit even more slavishly after Ike Eisenhower's military conquest of Little Rock/Arkansas in 1958 than it had been during the North's occupation in 1865. Again, the South was told by the North exactly what it had to do if it did not want to relive the horrific mass killings, suffering and devastation of three generations earlier. As in a historical illustration of the Hindu-White doctrine of karma, the xenophobic hatred of the South returned to destroy the American South once again.

The mental anguish of the South after 1865, the lost war of 1861-1865, Reconstruction 1862-1877¹⁵⁶ and the poverty afterward were portrayed by Wilbur J. Cash in one of the few original and great works of American intellectual history^^ No wonder that in early 1917 a brilliant and sane tactician like Fighting Bob in the U.S. Senate was able to distract the mentally ill Senator John Williams of Mississippi from his intended role of supporting Wilson's psychotic war-mongering against Germany, and cause him to erupt into an intemperate, hysterical verbal attack on his Northern colleagues that ended in one hell of a rant.

Williams screamed that the British starvation blockade of Germany was bad, but was nothing compared to Lincoln's sordid 1861-1865 blockade of the South and other Yankee crimes, of which the cowardly sexual brutalities of the victorious Unionists against the women of the defeated South were not the least

Bob pulled off this neat tactical trick by merely reminding Williams and the other Senate colleagues that the Union was ungrateful to Germany. He recalled how, despite the North's initial numerical superiority, 159 its losses had been so high that General U. S. Grant's 160 decisive Virginia campaign of 1864-1865 would not have been sustained had not Lincoln's immigration offices in Central Europe hastily recruited German boys in large numbers.

Bob's historically accurate claim that German Boys had saved the Union in 1865-just as they had stormed Gibraltar and won the War of the Spanish Succession the century before, giving London economic control over all of Latin America-immediately brought Williams to the height of anger against the South's real enemy: the North, not Germany. After all, those from the South only wanted to harm Spain, Mexico, China, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, Italy, Japan and Romania (1895-1945) because they were not strong enough to do so with the Damnyankee North.

Almost every Southern politician in 1917 was still brooding over the lost war of 1861-1865, wondering why Virginia's George Washington had succeeded against England and Lord North, while Mississippi's Jeff Davis had failed against Abe Lincoln, a far greater scoundrel than Lord North had been, and against the Union, which after 1830 treated the South with nothing but cattle-like sadism and cruelty.

Baruch's origins and youth

Wilson and Baruch's fathers were both Confederate veterans, but their roles in that war and their socioeconomic positions in the Old South were very different. Wilson's father's background was lower-middle class: he was descended from a moderately educated Presbyterian minister in the remote Staunton, Virginia area. Baruch's wealthy father, on the other hand, came from the Jewish upper-middle class of Charleston, South Carolina. Benjamin P. Judah, whom Confederate President Jeff Davis had made Secretary of the Treasury in the desperate hope of gaining at least some influence with the internationally all-powerful House of Rothschild, had been a personal friend of Baruch's Jewish mother^^

The wealth of Baruch's parents before, during and after the Civil War was proverbial. When General Sherman's Yankees approached the

Baroch mansion in 1865, they expected enormous loot. Coit records that the Yankee officer overseeing the looting reported to Sherman that there was "enough gold and silver to open a bank." The bluecoats destroyed and burned the Baruch mansion along with the entire neighboring town of Camden, but enough gold and silver had been hidden for the Barochs to live in comfort and luxury afterwards while their neighbors starved. They moved first to Winnsboro, South Carolina, a town outside the 40-mile-wide "scorched earth" zone that Sherman had ordered (the same Sherman after whom American tanks were named in World War II to show that Frank Roosevelt was also willing to physically destroy Germany). Coit noted that in Winnsboro the streets "were blue with Yankees ... wagons of booty and Negro whores" Today's Negro population in the USA, with its strong white admixture, is largely descended from these post-war Yankee-Negro liaisons, plus the mass rape of black girls - and not from those rare cases (George Washington is one of them) where intercourse between white masters (or white servants) and black female slaves had occurred in the pre-war South

Moviegoers in many countries are familiar with the scene from the first year of the Civil War in the film "Gone with the Wind", where every lady of the South eagerly gives all her gold rings and silver jewelry to the soldiers. It did not occur to General Sherman, however - and rightly so, as it turned out - that the Jewish Baruch family might have given some of their gold and silver to the Confederate cause after four years of desperate fighting. There was a remarkable difference in wartime between the Baruchs' opulence and the meagerness of Confederate commander General Robert E. Lee: "A single tent constituted his entire headquarters. It served the general and his adjutant. And when visitors were to be accommodated, the general shared his sheet with the adjutant and gave his sheet to the guest. His dinnerware was made of pewter - pewter plates, pewter cups, pewter bowls, everything was made of pewter ... "165

The Jews were banished from England for almost four hundred years until they returned to England during the bloodthirsty era of the dictator Oliver Cromwell, who needed them for his unusual money-raising schemes166. When Cromwell conquered Spanish Jamaica in 1655 and had the Spanish settlers there killed, Jews rushed there to exploit this large and rich sugar island. Jews were still banned from Spain, Portugal and Latin America in the 17th century. Bernard Baruch's mother Belle Baruch was descended from a wealthy Jamaican Jew, Rabbi Hartwig Co-hen167. Her father had been a successful businessman in Posen, Prussia, before emigrating to South Carolina, where he acquired many

large plantations and owned thousands of black slaves¹⁶⁸. When the Civil War broke out in April 1861, Baruch's mother - then only 11 - became engaged to 21-year-old Dr. Sirnon Baruch, who had graduated from Virginia Medical College. Dr. Baruch was formally appointed a field surgeon in the Confederate Army, but his wealth and position allowed him to move freely throughout the South and North during the war. He had come to the South in 1855 at the age of 15, ostensibly to avoid compulsory military service in Prussia - like Belle Baruch's father, he came from Posen in Prussia and spoke Yiddish, German and English¹⁶⁹. Sirnon and Belle Baruch had four sons. According to Talmudic superstition, the birth of so many sons meant that this marriage was specially blessed by Yahweh. Although Bernard Baruch was only ten years old when his family later left defeated South Carolina for victorious New York, he told Margaret Coit many years later that he could still remember the mass ravishments of Southern white women by Northern Negro soldiers, as well as how the blacks "rounded up young girls and dragged them off to prison." ¹⁷⁰ Baruch noted that such scenes excited him, and it was from this time that his "thirst for military glory" ¹⁷¹ stemmed. He also remembered the arrogant chanting of the black soldiers during Reconstruction: "Go way, whitefolks, you're too late. We'se de winnin' culler" ¹⁷².

Due to the corrupt election deal of 1877 between Hayes and Tilden¹⁷³, the horrors of the military occupation of the South were finally ended, but the intense plutocratic exploitation of the South by the North has continued to this day. In the meantime - as always when the Goyim are in crisis - rich Jews had made huge profits. The Barochs were by far the wealthiest family in Reconstructed Camden, where Baruch was born, and so there was quite naturally a feverish hatred of Jews throughout the South immediately after *Reconstruction*. It soon became clear that the Baruchs, despite their enormous wealth and connections in South Carolina, were no longer safe. In 1881, soon after the end of *Reconstruction*, they completed the liquidation of their property in the South and moved to New York City for good. Coit argues very convincingly that Baroch's later ruthless sadism was the product of early impressions in the *Reconstruction* South⁴.

The increasing importance of world Jewry

The Barochs came to New York City right at the beginning of the huge Jewish immigration flood into this unfortunate city⁵. The great

Jewish immigration wave lasted from the 1880s to the 1970s and resulted in the largest city in the United States becoming half Jewish and the largest Jewish settlement on earth with a Jewish population that in 1970 was larger than the population of the Jewish state of Israel.

Napoleon 1, the emperor consecrated by the Pope, was unable to reach an agreement with the Jewish Sanhedrin of Paris in 1807, after the French National Assembly had agreed to Jewish emancipation in its Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen sixteen years earlier. The Emperor then revoked those articles of the *Declaration* which, for the first time in a European country, had fully emancipated the foreign and subversively inclined Jews. At that time, in 1791, the Jews were not yet politically emancipated in any state of the USA. In 1807, Napoleon claimed that Jewish locusts were about to devour his beloved France. In 1812, however, the Jews took Ra-

before by having the Jewish community of Vilnius - known as the womb of European Jewry - destroy Napoleon's supply base in Smolensk. In this way, the Jews succeeded in destroying Napoleon's Grande Armee, on which the Napoleonic United Europe depended, despite Napoleon's uninterrupted victories. At the same time, the total emancipation of the Jews in Prussia (1812) delivered that country at the mercy or disfavor of the House of Rothschild and prepared the eventual destruction of Napoleonic rule in France^^

From secret Jewish headquarters in Russia, the plan was hatched and carried out in 1881 in which the Tsar Liberator Alexander II. was murdered by non-Jewish terrorists in a second, successful attempt - Alexander, who had liberated the last Russian serfs and generously allocated them land and was the last Romanov who still optimistically believed that he could make useful, patriotic citizens out of the Russian Jews. There was then a mild repression against the Jews for their innumerable terrorist crimes under the leadership of the brilliant, friendly lay Christian Konstantin Pobedonostsev, who was a personal friend of Cornell University President Andrew White¹⁷⁸ and who had worked under both Tsar Alexander ¹¹¹. (1881-1894) and Tsar Nicholas II (1894-1917). The Jews later claimed that they had destroyed Tsardom 36 years after the murder of the Tsar Liberator because of the oppression that followed this base and cowardly murder - but in reality the B'nai B'rith had already decided to destroy Russia when the French crushed the infamous Jewish Paris Commune in 1871. The assassination of the Tsar Liberator - celebrated by Jewish rabbis around the world as a masterstroke - was the effect, not the cause, of the outbreak of worldwide

Jewish terror that began in 1881[^]

Hitler's defense policy against world Jewry - which had sought to destroy Germany for thirty-six years from the Basel Zionist Congress in 1897 until Hitler came to power - had to serve as a justification when Theodore Kaufman¹⁸⁰ publicly demanded six months before Pearl Harbor that the entire German population of over 80 million should be killed and their country made uninhabitable for a thousand years. As the Polish envoy Jerzy Graf Potocky correctly informed his home foreign ministry in 1939, the entire American mass media was under Jewish control, and Potocky was also right to assume that the Jews still hated the Poles and only wanted to use them as a tool and sacrifice them as part of their plan to destroy Germany. Kaufman's book - the most horrible thing written by anyone in any country during World War II - was showered with rave reviews from coast to coast in the US for months, and this in a supposedly neutral country. It's easy to imagine how many goyim heads the Jews in America would roll if it ever came to an attempt to fight the one hundred percent Jewish control of public life and the destiny of this country that has existed for sixty-five years without serious threat.

Although Bernard Baruch went on to own vast estates elsewhere, New York City remained his permanent home from 1881 onwards[^]. Belle, his mother, proudly tracked down her first New York ancestor in 1695: a slave trader from Jamaica who occasionally sailed under the Danish flag^{^2}. After arriving in New York, Bernard Baruch lived with his wealthy family in an elegant brownstone mansion on modern West 57th Street in Manhattan^{^3}. Baruch, the would-be militarist, devoted himself superficially to boxing for a few months and later had public-relations photos taken showing him naked to the belt in boxer's pose, appearing to all the world like Mickey Cohen, one of the more ruthless Jewish American gangsters of the 20th century^{^^}

He initially wanted to become a rich doctor like his father, but soon found out that - despite his family's already enormous wealth - there would be too little in it. He entered the City College of New York at the age of 14 (on the corner of 23rd Street and Lexington Avenue, where the Bernard M. Baruch School of Business and Public Administration is now located¹⁸⁶). His best friend was Louis Rothschild, a nephew of "the famous brothers Oscar, Isidor and Nathan Strauss" ¹⁸⁷, the three most unscrupulous Jewish bandits in the history of American commerce.

Baruch was soon removed from City College for being a troublemaker. He applied to New York's well-known Hudson River West Point Military Academy, which had been accepting qualified Jewish applicants for many years, but his reputation had preceded him and he

was rejected¹⁸⁸. Then, using family connections, he returned to City College and graduated with a below-average grade, despite the fact that many of his class were working while studying, but he was not¹⁸⁹. As a gift for the

After his graduation, he was given a luxury trip to the homeland of his two grandfathers, Posen/Prussia. Baruch assured Coit that his father had taught him long before this trip to Germany to thoroughly hate all Germans - just as Albert Einstein had been taught by his parents in his native German town of Ulm/Württemberg¹⁹⁰. Europe bored Baruch, and he soon longed to return to the fleshpots of home. Coit emphasized that "the New York of Baruch's youth was a city of sin "¹⁹¹.

Wall Street's "Lone Lion"

Baruch's first nominal job in New York in 1889 was as an assistant in a business office, but great things were on the horizon as his mother was close friends with Meyer Guggenheim, a greedy Jewish plutocrat of enormous wealth and with seven sons. Baruch cultivated a friendship with one of these sons, Daniel Guggenheim, according to Belle's instructions¹⁹². As a teenager, Baruch was sent by the Guggenheims as a business messenger to J. P. Morgan Sr. who was variously known as "Morgan the Magnificent" and "King of the New America "¹⁹³. Baruch later told Coit that this visit to Morgan was "the final impetus for a career in finance "¹⁹⁴.

Meanwhile, his father, Dr. Sirnon Baruch, had become the leading fashion doctor in New York society, "with prominent patients including Lillian Russell. "¹⁹⁵ Mother Belle arranged for Bernard to join the Wall Street brokerage firm of former textile merchant Julius Kohn¹⁹⁶. This appointment was the key to Baruch's later success in the international manipulation of money and investments, for "the Kohn firm specialized in arbitrage. "¹⁹⁷ Baruch told Coit that his entire career had been nothing more than "buying where the price was low and selling where it was high. "¹⁹⁸ In 1890, at the age of 20, Bernard Baruch was a wealthy young man traveling in Colorado, the Pacific Coast, and other regions of the Far West of the United States¹⁹⁹.

In the 1890s, he enjoyed what he called fun in business. He loved so-called railroad capers - the dishonest manipulation of shares in the exhausted and financially desiccated private railroad system, which, despite the enormous grants of land and money²⁰⁰ after 1850, was almost completely bankrupt in 1895 and thus ruined the ordinary

shareholders, but not cunning speculators like Baruch²⁰¹. At the age of twenty-five, Baruch was "glittering on Fifth Avenue in his Prince Albert coat, silk hat and striped pants." ²⁰² Arbitrage and stock manipulation did not require many hours of work every day, and Coit reports that Baruch knew how to fill his free time with "endless shifts of labor." ²⁰³

The net profit of 60,000 dollars that Baruch made one afternoon on a single sugar transaction would be equivalent to 1 million dollars in today's money, and his permanent seat on the New York Stock Exchange had only cost him 19,000 dollars²⁰⁴. When the war against Spain had been artificially brought about by the plutocrats, Baruch remembered the profit that Nathan Rothschild had made in London after the Battle of Waterloo (June 18, 1815): He had been the first to learn of the victory through his agents, but spread the news that the French had won and sold his government bonds (Consols) until he had triggered a financial panic and so-called sales avalanche and was able to buy up all the Consols for a penny. Thus Nathan Rothschild, this pale, round-headed Jew boy from Frankfurt's Judengasse with his ringlets, became the richest man in English history in one fell swoop. His victory was more impressive and memorable than the military success of General Blücher and the Duke of Wellington, because Nathan defeated Blücher and Wellington after they had pledged their gratitude to the House of Rothschild by overcoming Napoleon²⁰⁶.

Although a coup on the scale of Nathan Rothschild's London financial crime was only possible once, Baruch was able to skim large profits from the London market in July 1908 with the help of his excellent private intelligence service on war events, which he owed mainly to his friend Thomas F. Ryan, the corrupt New York political boss²⁰⁷. In return, he helped Ryan with a successful stock market raid on James Duke's American Tobacco Company. Ryan was so pleased that he gave Baruch 50000 dollars in cash for his dirty expert work to the detriment of the founder of Duke University in Durham/North Carolina²⁰⁸. Baruch was inducted into the Waldorf Crowd in Wall Street for a plethora of financial crimes that required little real work²⁰⁹.

Operating independently, he landed one unique financial coup after another in Wall Street from 1899 onwards and was famous as Wall Street's "Lone Lion" long before Charles Lindbergh, the "Lone Eagle", was born. Not yet thirty years old, Baruch realized with impious pride, immense satisfaction and wild joy that "men turned away and whispered when he passed." ²¹⁰ Baruch reminded Coit that there were many other Jewish "prodigies in Wall Street" in the 1890s, such as Morton Schwartz of Louisville, Kentucky, who had skimmed a million dollars from the market before he was twenty²¹¹. Both Schwartz and Baruch came from wealthy, connected Jewish families, as world Jewry and the international

House of Rothschild loved them, and there was no doubt at the turn of the century that it was an advantage to be a rich New York Jew boy who also knew something about the market²¹². The first two generations of Rothschild financial tycoons had opened up glorious prospects for subversive world Jewry, and so it was a real joy for the individual rich young Jew of the 1890s to be in the world.

A fateful encounter

Shortly before the Jewish seizure of power over the American monetary system by means of the Federal Reserve System, Baruch felt exhausted - not by his gallant affairs, but by the fact that he had so far only proved again and again how he could pocket millions of dollars with practically no work. At 42, however, he was a little too old to embark on a new career for the sake of military glory. So, in 1912, he jumped at the idea of making a name for himself, through money or otherwise, as an outstanding American "elder statesman" - a kind of political eminence grise behind the scenes who, however, did not shy away from the public eye, since Baruch knew that the mass media was in Jewish hands and appeared on the public scene on important occasions with relish, but with contempt for the stupid American goyim in his heart. Baruch immediately realized that decent, reformist politicians could never come to power on the corrupt stage of American federal politics, where the crass worship of naked wealth was more fervent than anywhere or any other time in the annals of mankind. Baruch came to this conclusion when he saw a political

crook, Teddy Roosevelt, was able to destroy the superhuman life's work and carefully planned program of the honest fighter Bob LaFollette²¹³. Baruch's opinion was solidified after he met the Democrat about to be elected President of the United States in 1912 and realized that America's straw man of the hour was a corrupt fool whom he himself could easily put in his pocket²¹⁴.

There is a particular irony in Baruch's influence on Woodrow Wilson in 1912. Wilson had broken with Colonel George Harvey, the partner of J. P. Morgan, who as predecessor of the Supreme House had prepared the Princeton man Wilson for the presidency. The reason: Harvey refused to publicly denounce Thomas F. Ryan, Baruch's longtime criminal crony²¹⁵. Wilson would never have dared to ask the rich and

disreputable Baruch to back off from Ryan, much less publicly accuse him. Baruch turned to his mother, who still dominated New York society, to arrange a first meeting with Wilson, and before that attended the Democratic Party convention in Baltimore - the first he had ever attended²¹⁶. The first Baruch-Wilson meeting took place in October 1912 on the sixth floor of the elegant Plaza Hotel in New York²¹⁷.

Baruch knew that Wilson, a reactionary by nature, had been spouting all sorts of disingenuous nonsense about progressivism in order to gain influence, so Baruch boldly took the bull by the horns in the first few minutes of the conversation. Wilson, on the other hand, like any literate adult American in 1912, knew that Baruch was one of the top sixty plutocratic miscreants. So Baruch asked bluntly, "Do you think a man should be punished for succeeding?" Wilson's soft answer was: "No." Under the circumstances, not only Fighting Bob, but any true Progressive would have given the scoundrel Baruch the proper answer without hesitation: The old American way that the right has to keep quiet when criminals are rich must end! Instead, the wolf in sheep's clothing simply agreed with Wilson. Baruch happily recalled that "some spark passed between us", and Coit was not exaggerating in claiming that it was "a meeting that changed the direction of Baruch's life and possibly that of history" ²¹⁸.

Baruch immediately began to educate Wilson about the importance of Marxism to global Jewish ambitions, as he himself was deeply involved in the behind-the-scenes struggle to enable elected Jewish Marxists to enter the New York state legislature[^] The US was still far behind Germany in tolerating Jewish Marxism at this time. In 1912, for example, four of the six members of the Reichstag in Berlin were Marxist Jews. Jewish world domination was advancing simultaneously in two sectors: on the extreme right, which included plutocracy and authoritarian Zionist chauvinism, and on the extreme left, which embraced Bolshevism and the condemnation of all nationalism except Jewish nationalism. The stupid goyim of the West found themselves between the arms of a huge Jewish pincer movement. Both wings of this New York-directed offensive to achieve permanent Jewish world domination were equally important. Baruch's discovery that Wilson - like Roosevelt - loved the Jews more than a Jew himself was invaluable in initiating, for the first time, a top U.S. official into the secret mysteries of the worldwide Jewish conspiracy. Although Wilson had long since turned his back on the Christianity of his fathers, the ice-cold and practical Baruch found in him an extremely emotional man of a very different spiritual hunger, a "good hater" and "instinctive zealot" - and

that was an ideal combination for Baruch's political intentions. Moreover, Wilson, like Baruch himself, was an insatiable womanizer, and so Baruch was soon dragging him backstage (to the theater dressing rooms) all over New York²²⁰ Baruch told Wilson at the conclusion of their alliance, "I was born a Democrat, a Southern man, a Confederate. "22\ Had Wilson not been so emotional, he would have recognized the height of absurdity in this, given that Jeff Davis' and Robert E. Lee's Confederate states had been dead for five years when Baruch was born.

Baruch made "a very significant last-minute contribution" to Wilson's November 1912 election victory. He admitted to Coit that he may have given the largest of all donations, more even than Henry Morgenthau Sr. but he would not say exactly how much² 22^ The amount of this 1912 Baruch election donation, while certainly crucial to an understanding of 20th century history, has never been clarified. Wilson's pseudo-progressive New Freedom program of 1913-1914 (which was essentially the

tariff reduction) was acceptable to the international arbitrage free trader Baruch²²³. He later described it as the basis for Frank Roosevelt's New Deal of 1933, including Secretary of State Cordeil Hull's politically influenced Reciprocal Trade Agreements²²⁴.

Baruch becomes Wilson's friend and main advisor

The American people of 1912, victims as usual of their own corrupt federal electoral system, thought they had elected Wilson, but it becomes clear from a subsequent analysis of Wilson's presidency that the real winner was Bernard Baruch, who rode invisibly on Wilson's back to power and remained there for many decades during the presidencies of Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower. None of these seven weak men-the supposed leaders of the American nation-dared to challenge this inordinately egotistical Jewish "eider statesman", who effectively seized permanent power over the degenerate plutocratic political and socio-economic system of the United States. At no time in the late Roman Empire did the people have less say in important political decisions than in the USA between 1913 and 1961 under Bernard Baruch - a period that included the two senseless world wars.

Coit observed that after Wilson's first inauguration on March 4, 1913, "Baruch became a frequent visitor to the White House "225. After

careful study of Wilson's schedule of visits, Coit noted that on March 9, 1917-the day Wilson pondered the most important question of his presidency, namely whether it was the right time to send Congress his trimmed and distorted war message against Germany-on that entire day, Baruch was "Wilson's only appointment. The fact that the American people were overwhelmingly against going to war right up to the last minute no longer bothered Wilson in the slightest once he had his second presidential election victory in the bag. Wilson's only concern was to please the man who had become his lord and master: Bernard Baruch. It was not the general will of the people that mattered, as Rousseau had once defined it. The only thing that mattered in the USA in 1917 was the will of Bernard Baruch.

Coit notes that in 1917 Baruch had replaced the Jew House as Wilson's chief advisor because Baruch offered Wilson the "warm, understanding friendship that Colonel House could never have given him. "227 Coit also noticed that in these crucial days the following dialogue between the two recurred frequently: "I don't agree with you, Mr. President. Sorry, sir" - and Wilson's reply: "Let's hear your reasoning "228.

Since House was irrevocably replaced by Baruch, in Coit's opinion the two most important Jews in Wilson's life until his death in 1924 were Bernard Baruch and Louis Dembitz Brandeis - the latter continued to be the head of American Zionism even after Wilson had made him a judge on the Supreme Court. The fact that Brandeis saw no conflict of interest in these simultaneous functions speaks for itself. The fanatically pro-Jewish Wilson was naturally delighted with this situation, which he knew Congress would not dare to challenge in view of the enormous power of the Jews.

The case of Baruch was special in that Wilson surrendered his entire identity as a sovereign individual to this man. As Coit carefully puts it in her summarizing analysis of this one-sided friendship: "Wilson came to know and admire the Wall Street man "229.

Without this empty and illusory friendship, which for Baruch was only a means to an end, Wilson would have stood by his 1916 Sussex Treaty to Kaiser Wilhelm and supported it in December 1916 when Germany offered a peace without annexations before the world - a fair, civilized and humane peace among equals. Instead, Baruch and Wilson allowed their Secretary of State, Lansing, to inform the world that if Britain rejected the German offer and continued to insist on enforcing a "Carthaginian" peace, the United States would likely enter the war on the side of the Allies. The bloodthirsty and savagely brutal British leadership was relieved by Lansing's treacherous revelation-and

events took their course, dramatically accelerating toward barbarism in Europe and around the world.

It was a costly false friendship, this sick relationship between Woody Wilson and Bernard Baruch. It not only cost^e xtra million lives and resulted in the triumph of Bolshevism in Russia (due to the unnecessary extension of the war beyond 1916), but also brought Baruch to power in the USA for good, where twenty years later the decisive word on war and peace for Europe and America would once again be spoken. Baruch's conversion of Wilson to his own ends ultimately cost the world, at the most conservative estimate, 75 million violent deaths, with the victims including above all the youth of the West and Russia of two generations.

LaFollette in the US Senate: Fight for the freedom of the Philippines,
against Wilson's Mexican War and for
American neutrality toward the European war

Fighting Bob was the exact opposite of Baruch and Wilson. Bob was of the same opinion as Bryan (the 1900 Democratic presidential candidate against McKinley and Teddy Roosevelt) that the American annexation of the Asian Philippines (1898) was an appalling crime that should be reversed, and in 1907 Bob unsuccessfully introduced a resolution in the Senate in favor of immediate self-determination and independence for the Philippines²³⁰. Bob could not have known what would only become public knowledge in 1976, namely that in the 1898-1901 War of Independence under the leadership of Emilio Aguinaldo - the George Washington of the Filipinos - regular American professional military under General Funston killed 640000 Filipino civilians on the island of Luzon alone²³¹.

After all, it was widely known in Bob's day that the rapacious, long-serving regular U.S. soldiers had tortured and murdered tens of thousands of Filipino civilians, that probably less than 2 percent of Filipinos desired American rule, and that the annexation of a vast colonial possession in Asia made the unilateral Monroe Doctrine of 1823 an empty farce²³².

This Monroe Doctrine, which U.S. Secretary of State John Quincy Adams successfully foisted on President Monroe (in lieu of a deceptive joint Anglo-American declaration on Latin America that British Prime Minister Canning wanted), included the offer that the U.S. would forever refrain from any political and military intervention in the Eastern

Hemisphere if Europe refrained from establishing additional colonies in the Western Hemisphere. With the exception of the British occupation of the Argentine Falkland Islands (1833) and the unsuccessful Spanish attempt to regain Mexico (1829), all European states honored their commitment to the unilateral agreement proposed by the US - and it would have been a blessing for all mankind if the US itself had done the same. Unfortunately, however, it became a bad English-style habit for the US from its earliest beginnings to break its foreign policy commitments - including, for example, all agreements with the Indians and the partially successful attempts to conquer Canada, Florida, Cuba, Texas, California and New Mexico, after having made solemn promises in numerous treaties never to do so²³³.

Thelen did not exaggerate in stating that Bob "fought bitterly" against Wilson's mad undeclared war against Mexico in 1913-1916.²³ In fact, this grotesque Wilsonian adventure led Bob and many of his fellow progressives to the conviction that the former history teacher at Bryan Mawr Girls' School, Wilson, was a pathological person with an insatiable hunger (like Abe Lincoln two generations earlier) to become a glamorous war president, no matter the cost to the peoples of the earth and his own credibility in history.

Thelen emphasizes that LaFollette was one of those Americans who undoubtedly formed the overwhelming majority and who were truly neutral in their thinking immediately after the outbreak of the First World War. This attitude was the only normal one for a so-called assimilated American, since the USA had pre-war ties to both European camps, and yet American interests were not directly involved either at the outbreak of the war or in its course. (This was only the case when Britain unilaterally abrogated the entire existing international law of the sea and Wilson condoned this typically English crime). Wilson's policy of condoning British crimes under international law while at the same time urging Germany to "assume strict responsibility" was therefore just as pathological for Bob and all other progressives as Wilson's Mexican policy. Indeed, it is fair to say that the US had a veritable madman at the helm long before he became unmistakably insane in 1919. The worst of it was that the plutocratic US Constitution of 1789 gave the American president such enormous power, far greater than that of any European political leader at the outbreak of war in 1914.²³⁵

The arms deliveries to the Entente;

LaFollette tries the people

to mobilize against the USA's entry into the war

When the full implications of Wilson's wartime foreign policy became apparent during the first year of hostilities, LaFollette acted immediately. First, he advocated the kind of "declaration of neutrality to avert war" with all the additional legislative guarantees from Congress that was later adopted by Bob's disciples after his death in 1935-1937. Following Frank Roosevelt's pathological Chicago Bridge speech of October 1937, the New Deal warmongers began to dismantle this carefully constructed legislative edifice piece by piece, since the intent of this legislation was to avoid unnecessary wars, whereas Frank Roosevelt and his supporters, especially the Jewish ones, thirsted for war and for the blood-money profits from such unnecessary wars. Once Bob had demonstrated in the pages of the Congressional Record, 1914-1917, in all exactness that the President of the United States was mentally unstable, irresponsible, inconsistent, and above all terribly biased in favor of the alien aspirations of British imperialism, Bolshevism, and Zionism - all of which prospered at the expense of the welfare of mankind - it followed that, barring impeachment of Wilson, Congress should use constitutional means to restrain the President and secure the vital interests of the American people. Wilson's own worldview was totally alien to at least nine-tenths of Americans.

Second, as early as the first year of the European conflict, Bob submitted bills to Congress to stop the business of war, at least as far as the United States was concerned. J. P. Morgan and J. D. Rockefeller Sr. made no secret of the fact that they rejoiced in the war and the carnage because of its profitability. By blithely pumping American money into the Anglo-French camp, they created, from the very beginning and through their private initiative, a special U.S. commitment to the Allied victory. If a majority in Congress had had the decency to follow Bob, this evil international conspiracy would have been put to an end by 1915 at the latest. Disastrously, however, the worship of money of any kind was the chief weakness not only of Congress but of the American people as a whole. As in 1940-1941, the dirty, lucrative American war profiteering quickly became irresistible. The American plutocrats had more money than ever in 1915 to bribe the still corrupt Congress, but it was not necessary, as the innate American greed for easy money proved strong enough to defeat Bob and override all moral concerns, Christian and otherwise.²³⁶ Had John Adams, second U.S. president and best connoisseur of the American character, had lived, he certainly would not have been surprised by the tragic outcome of 1917, but his own behavior in opposing Hamilton's criminal undeclared war against France in 1798 (which cost him a second presidential term) suggests that he would have

supported Bob's hopeless struggle with heart and soul no matter what the outcome. Whatever John Adams' faults may have been, he was not a moral relativist or a pragmatic 20th century American-style radical humanist, but a man of honor with some real principles.

Bob's understandable distaste for the devastation and butchery that British imperialism was inflicting on the world tempted him to make the mistake of traveling to Europe with other Congressmen on Henry Ford Sr.'s "peace ship" in 1915. But the realpolitik man in Bob convinced him at the last minute that there was no real chance of defeating the Anglo-American conspiracy with platonic goodwill gestures of this kind. Henry Ford could not fulfill his promise to have the European boys out of the trenches and home with their families where they belonged by Christmas 1915²³⁸ But LaFollette used every available public forum to hammer home to the American people his message that Wilson's piously proclaimed policy of neutrality was a fraud and that citizens should insist on it, the US Congress to take practical steps to rein in this dishonest president²³⁹ After Bryan was eliminated by Wilson, it was LaFollette who argued that the US owed atonement to Europe for allowing American merchants of death to export their war goods and thus prolong the war, while in England and France, too, the people were in favor of a reasonable negotiated peace with Germany. In Bob's view in 1915, the only response could only be a total cessation of all American trade for the duration of the war - which would have amounted to Jefferson's one-year embargo of 1807 against England and France, which most historical experts credit with keeping the U.S. out of the European war of that year.

Bob also started a popular American movement in 1915 that was destined to live for 26 years until Frank Roosevelt brought about the Pearl Harbor raid of 1941: the movement in favor of demanding that the voters - and not the hopelessly venal Congress - should ultimately decide war and peace. Bob made it clear that in England, where Parliament was never consulted on the question of war or peace, a single corrupt leader, Edward Grey, was able to plunge his country into war. The ministerial resignations of Burns and Morley in August 1914 proved to Bob - correctly, as later official revelations confirmed - that Grey had been making his own decisive moves for years without confiding in the Cabinet or even the House of Commons. The situation was somewhat less stark in the US, where Congress could veto a presidential war message, but, as Bob made clear to voters, this difference was largely illusory, as the US Congress had been corrupt and indifferent to the will of the people from its earliest beginnings.

Although since 1913 the US Senate was also elected by the people, Congress continued to represent only the plutocratic evildoers and not the American people. Bob said it succinctly and clearly: if there was a corrupt presidency, a corrupt Congress and corrupt courts at the same time, then there was reason enough to call for a referendum on the question of peace or war. The American situation was completely different from that of Europe, where - apart from England - powerful nations were crowded together. The United States had only weak neighbors, such as sparsely populated Canada and backward Mexico. They did not face overwhelming disadvantages like Germany in 1914, when every hour counted with the threat of war looming. Unlike Germany, the USA could easily afford the salutary luxury of a referendum on the war. Baruch and Wilson, meanwhile, used every dirty weapon at their disposal to attack Bob's plan, and Wilson resorted to the scurrilous expedient of a public personal attack on LaFollette²⁴ long before entering the war.

Incidentally, he was not fooled for a minute by the false peace slogan in Wilson's 1916 presidential campaign. This slogan was in fact forced on Wilson against his express wishes at the Democratic Party convention by Martin Glyn from New York, who gave the programmatic speech. Bob remained on his guard, knowing full well that Wilson would be hell-bent on war after winning the election. Within six weeks of the election, Wilson destroyed Kaiser Wilhelm's initiative towards a peace of self-determination among equals - despite his oft-repeated solemn promise to have the initiative supported by his Berlin ambassador Gerard. This, of course, meant that All bets were off that Wilson's Sussex Pledge would be kept, which stated: restriction of the V-boat war by Germany in exchange for Wilson's promise to support the German push towards negotiated peace after his re-election. When Germany then announced that it would resume its V-boat offensive against the British starvation blockade on February 1, 1917, Wilson shamelessly pretended that this was a bolt from the blue and an example of so-called German lawlessness. Bob was not in the least surprised at how servilely the Jewish-controlled American media passed on Wilson's insane lies without any critical comment.

Baruch and Wilson came to the conclusion that they could get their much desired war by turning the entire American merchant fleet, on which war contraband was flowing to England and France, into auxiliary

cruisers with orders to open fire on all German ships on sight. For this new act of aggression against Germany, however, they needed the approval of Congress, and that meant overcoming Fighting Bob's opposition^{24\}

LaFollette began his desperate filibuster against Wilson's Armed Ship Bill in the Senate on February 26, 1917. Everyone has heard of the violence in Congress when emotions ran high during the 1850s, before the outbreak of the Civil War. Wilson's mendacity had enraged a portion of American public opinion by February 1917, as well as a significant portion of Congress. When LaFollette had the floor on March 4, 1917, his good friend Senator Harry Lane of Oregon remarked that Wilson's friend Senator Ollie James of Kentucky was playing with a pistol under his jacket. Lane, without hesitation, warned James that he himself had a knife with him and would slit Ollie's throat if he made the slightest move against Bob. This was just a typical example of many similar incidents during those hectic weeks²⁴².

At one point, it looked as if a group of chauvinistic senators from the South had arranged to storm in on Bob to prevent him from continuing to speak by force. But he realized it in time and smilingly made the self-assured statement: "I will continue to speak until I have finished my statement, unless someone carries me away - and I want to see the man who could do that first" ²⁴³.

Belle, Bob's wife, was thrilled by his great personal courage. She was one hundred percent behind him every step of the way. Every minute of every day of this terrible and hysterical period, they were both prepared to stake their lives on their convictions. Knowing their country intimately - all its corruption, crudity and lack of culture - they were not surprised that Wilson and Baruch, with the help of their war propaganda monopoly, were able to turn millions of Americans into homicidal maniacs. One is reminded of Nietzsche's wise observation that madness is the exception in individuals, but the rule in groups. A weakness for killing, for cruelty and massacre was part of the American character from the very beginning. The father of Virginia's greatest hero, Robert E. Lee, had his nose cut off by an angry mob in Baltimore, whereupon he went into exile because he did not want his family to see him disfigured. Violence and intolerance had always been the main ingredients of life in the American community. Bob and Belle were aware that it would take many generations to educate Americans towards true civilization - and this only on the assumption that at some hypothetical point in the future the USA would get a clean education system (which it has never looked like doing²⁴⁴).

Ellen Glasgow, the most talented female American novelist of the 20th century, made it clear in one of her novels²⁴⁵ that under Wilson's presidency, Americans became drunken savages and contemptuously abandoned their hollow claim to be civilized. She added: "When it was all over, the people were like a bunch of hungover people after a heavy bender. The conservative, pro-German New York Jew Ludwig Lewisohn²⁴⁶ said that the pent-up frustration of corrupt bourgeois city life in America had made the people easy victims of Wilson's distorted propaganda and his sadistic propaganda director George Creel²⁴⁸.

Typical of Wilson's cowardly and dishonest treatment of all decent Americans who disagreed with him was his public comment about LaFollette and ten other senators who openly participated in Bob's filibuster against Wilson's auxiliary cruiser legislation. Wilson claimed that "a small body of obstinate men, who represent no opinion but their own, have rendered the great government of the United States helpless and contemptible. "²⁴⁸ Quite apart from the fact that the corrupt US government of plutocratic miscreants in 1917 was anything but great, rather a disgrace before the whole civilized world, it must be said that it was Wilson's own incompetence alone, from the day he took office in 1913, that made that government contemptible in the eyes of all decent people, at home and abroad.

The American hunt for blood-money while millions of Europeans were being killed with American tools of death was probably not edifying to anyone in the world. But the compelling evidence that Wilson was already psychotic in 1917, before the American entry into the war, and not only after the armistice in 1918, was provided by his claim that Bob and his progressive friends had no kindred spirits and spoke only for themselves. No serious historian has ever denied that the American people were overwhelmingly opposed to active U.S. participation in the war until Wilson demanded it in 1917, and that the sole purpose of Wilson's Armed Ships Bill was to hasten entry into the war. - Bob a maverick? He had once won his first election as an independent Republican in 1880, fighting a corrupt but strong Republican Party machine - thirty years before Wilson first entered an election in 1910, with the help of J. P. Morgan and a corrupt party machine. Baruch and Wilson - and not Bob and his group - were "willful men who held only their own opinions. "²⁴⁹

Once thrust into the war, America became a madhouse of war fever and the harassment and brutalization of decent people. To be sure, there

had been genuine enthusiasm in the belligerent countries of Europe in 1914, but they had all, without exception, been paragons of dignity and sobriety compared to the crudely colonial and still largely uncivilized United States of 1917-1918. It was mindless sadism when the Anglophile Cincinnati Post - in a traditionally German-American Ohio town - berated Bob "Von" LaFollette for being "a wharfie's order taker" ².

Like nothing else, this wild outbreak of 1917-1918 proved that, contrary to Bob's earlier hopes, there was still no chance that the USA could become a decent country in the 20th century, capable of making its modest contribution to the global betterment of mankind. On the contrary, the USA represented exactly what Oswald^Spengler warned of at that time, namely the consequence of a spatial separation of power and culture. Culturally advanced Europe would perish the moment its own power was overshadowed by the power of the uncivilized USA, whether in 1917, 1941 or at a later time in the 20th century.

Wilson rashly and eagerly seized the role of war dictator by countering LaFollette's legal filibuster with typical Wilsonian lawlessness: on March 9, 1917, he announced the arming of American merchant ships by presidential order ²⁵¹. Coit reports that Wilson's only appointment that day was Baruch ²⁵². The inherently hysterical Wilson needed someone to dominate him, first Harvey, then House, then Baruch (as in the even worse case of Frank Roosevelt, where the advisors were first Louis Howe and after 1934 Harry Hopkins). There can be no doubt that Baruch prompted the decision of March 9 that paved the way for Wilson's war message of April 2 and the congressional declaration of war on April 6. This evil Jew, who came from a family of evil Jews who stole what they could steal, was never a candidate for any elective office in the United States and yet plunged America into war against the will of the majority of its citizens. Wilson's own wickedness gave Baruch that influence, but Wilson was a psychotic, a wreck of a man who barely knew what he was doing.

Like many Jews, rich and poor, Baruch was of consummate arrogance and utter contempt for the Goyim. World Jewry and England made a special pact - made public later in 1917 by an official letter from British Foreign Secretary Balfour to Lord Rothschild - and then agreed it was time for the US to enter the war. World Jewry alone, with Baruch as its instrument, carried out this decision. World Jewry, not British propaganda, dragged America into both world wars. England was arguably responsible for starting these wars in Europe, but only world Jewry had the power to dictate the role of the US in these greatest of wars

where no real US interests were at stake.

The war is here; the banner of the six steadfast senators

Three of the now armed American merchant ships were sunk in the course of hostilities in March 1917. Wilson decided to take his war message to Congress on April 2. In doing so, he relied on the same fallacious reasoning he had used in his argument with the former Princeton students seven years earlier: Only his, Wilson's, point of view was the democratic one, he claimed, and, "The world must be made safe for democracy." ²⁵³ This was nothing short of grotesque, for Wilson's only political attachment throughout his political career had been to the anti-democratic Pluto oligarchy.

During the heated debate over Wilson's war message, LaFollette demanded an immediate call for a referendum on peace or war, which he confidently predicted the U.S. would vote 10-1 against the war. Senator Williams of Mississippi, who despite his many debate defeats to Bob was still Wilson's foreign policy spokesman in the Senate, claimed in the course of a vulgar personal attack on LaFollette that he was "a better German than the leaders of Germany themselves." ²⁵⁴ The Wilson administration freely issued vicious and murderous threats. In the end, the Senate vote was 82-6 in favor of war - with 8 abstentions - and in the House of Representatives, 50 members voted against the war. Three Democrats, including Harry Lane of Oregon, sided with Bob in the Senate, but the only Republicans were Gronna and Norris ²⁵⁵ It is widely believed that, given the

flood of threats and intimidation, no senator would have dared to speak out against the war at all if Bob had not done so. The war hysteria in official circles had become a tyrannical frenzy since Wilson's crazy war message of April 2. The Anglophile Boston Evening Transcript called for LaFollette to be stripped of his American citizenship, proclaiming, "From now on he is the man without a country" ⁶ .

LaFollette does not bow to Wilsonian terror

Thelen confirms that the US entry into the war made the Wilson regime even more reactionary than it had been before ²⁵⁷ . Bob persisted

in his efforts to curb the excesses of the Pluto oligarchy, which was now going mad with lust and greed. He struck back immediately by proposing comprehensive wartime legislation to stop war profiteering and vigorously pushed this agenda throughout 1917 against all odds²⁵⁸. Despite all the fierce attacks by Wilson's supporters, he retained his support among broad sections of the American masses for a long time. For example, when he spoke in St. Paul, Minnesota, on September 20, 1917, the Municipal Auditorium was packed, and there was a five-minute stunned ovation before his speech began. Once he got going, Bob laid out the plain truth to the people without any embellishments or compromises. The crowd shouted over and over, "We know, Bob!" He and Belle were happy that night on the drive back to Madison/Wisconsin, but Wilson's agents, scattered among the crowd in St. Paul, were furious. Wilson agreed to a nationwide "vigilance campaign" against Bob and his supporters on September 21, 1917, and Nickolas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, publicly declared that they might as well poison the food of American soldiers by allowing Bob to speak²⁵⁹. (The same Murray had also publicly stated four years earlier that Kaiser Wilhelm II, if he were an American, could easily be elected President of the United States because of his goodness and extraordinary ability). Bob responded to this abuse, like the myriad death threats, with a contemptuous reference to a plague from America's bygone days: "The old Tory gang" ²⁶⁰.

Bob and Belle quietly collected all the public attacks until Bob announced he would respond to each of them on the Senate floor on October 6, 1917. The Senate galleries were packed, as they always were when Bob was on the speakers list. He fiercely defended to his audience his right to tell the truth even in wartime²⁶¹. The Wilson clique in the Senate behaved as crudely and rudely as could be expected under the circumstances: Senator Robinson of Arkansas claimed that Bob belonged either in prison or in Germany; Senator Fall of New Mexico - who went to prison a few years afterward for secretly selling the U.S. Navy's oil reserves - declared that Bob was a revolutionary agent who intended to overthrow the U.S. government by violent means. The gallery gave LaFollette overwhelming support²⁶² during the hurtful dispute,

In 1917-1918, Bob was often spat on by women in public. A man never dared to do that - Bob's fighter qualities were too well known for that. He had the right answer for every attack, but gradually the slander became overpowering. So the Creel office had tens of thousands of Four Minute Men deployed up and down the country. These were mentally

unstable volunteer speakers who appeared everywhere in front of theaters, department stores, churches and gave their crazy speeches against LaFollette and the Kaiser.

Unfortunately, the American public knew next to nothing about world history and current world events. Their own media provided only blatant propaganda and mendacious gossip. Under the outrageous hurricane of stultifying media abuse, previously intelligent people began to lose their mental stability and take on forms of pathological thinking and behavior. In January 1918, for example, 421 professors and lecturers at the University of Wisconsin accused LaFollette of alleged disloyalty to the USA in a public petition. And the Anglophile clique in the Wisconsin legislature later in 1918 voted by a majority in favor of a Wisconsin state resolution condemning Bob for sedition. Thelen suspects that many who voted against Bob secretly agreed with him, but feared for their own safety - especially the German-Americans²⁶³. Thelen says that the German-Americans who praised LaFollette for his stance before the USA entered the war^e were sufficiently intimidated to accuse him of treason after the war²⁶⁴. It is even more plausible to assume that many of them did not even know that even in wartime there was such a thing as a

right to their own, dissenting opinion. (Unlike German emigration to Latin America, German emigration to the USA had been of great quantity, but overall of rather low quality).

Bob did what he could to fight the irrational abuse of power at the top and the failure of many of his followers at the bottom. The American system-it would be wrong to call it an American civilization-was above all a herd system of conformist goyim robots blindly following Jewish leaders. The gentile plutocratic miscreants had acquiesced in 1917 to the idea of permanent Jewish leadership of the United States. Henry Ford Sr, the only exception, did not capitulate to Jewish pressure until 1923²⁶⁵. Bob sued two Wisconsin dailies for calling him a traitor - the Madison Democrat (in November 1917) and the Wisconsin State Journal (in January 1918). Needless to say, thanks to the proverbially corrupt American judicial system, he had not the slightest chance of any success in these proceedings^{266^}.

The U.S. Senate formed a special investigating committee in 1918 to strip LaFollette of his Senate seat. Looking closely through the Congressional Record of 1918, one finds that Bob was clearly eclipsed in the Senate's activities during that terrible and hysterical year^^ Then, in February 1919, Bob sponsored the Hiram Johnson resolution calling for the withdrawal of American troops from Russia. But even this sensible

and salutary measure - three months after the armistice with Germany - was defeated by one vote²⁶⁸ Many American conscientious objectors were sentenced to death in 1917-1918, in contrast to Germany, where 25,000 of them were admitted to service without arms in World War I (similarly in World War II, individual groups such as the German Quakers). Bob acted as an advocate for conscientious objectors and did what he could to represent their interests. He also fought against the outrageous imprisonment of Eugene Debs, the 1912 and 1916 Socialist presidential candidate. Debs, a hero and philosopher who declared that he would not feel free as long as thousands of his supporters were in American concentration camps and prisons, was housed in the incredibly brutal Atlanta, Georgia prison, a huge complex of concentration camps where corporal punishment was not abolished until 1945. Despite Bob's constant efforts, nothing could be done for Debs - a kind, non-violent political philosopher of Alsatian descent - until Wilson's second term ended²⁶⁹.

The right to free speech in war

Bob campaigned throughout 1919 for the right of free speech in the US Congress even in wartime - a right that should have been secured much earlier. Senator Vallandigham of Ohio had fought hard but unsuccessfully for this right during the Civil War, but President Lincoln had Vallandigham arrested and imprisoned in violation of his parliamentary immunity. LaFollette was no more successful in his fight than his colleague from Ohio 54 years earlier - even though there was no longer a war in 1919 - and yet their efforts stemmed from genuine patriotism and the desire to free their people from the tyranny of the American reactionary Pluto oligarchy²⁷⁰. In total contrast to the USA, there was complete freedom of speech in the German Reichstag throughout the First World War. The British and French were astounded by this German phenomenon, their own parliamentarians envious. In the USA, however, the idea that Congress should be able to speak freely during the war has not made the slightest progress to this day. - That Hitler abolished this right in Germany after 1933 is not surprising in view of the fact that Germany had first been paralyzed and then destroyed by the subversion of the Reichstag deputies of the SPD, the USPD and the KPD during the First World War. In fact, it is impossible to imagine that Germany would have been defeated after its victory over Russia in 1918 if there had been the same political war controls in

Germany as in England, France and the USA. Nor would Russia have collapsed if the Tsar had not granted the Duma freedoms similar to those of the German Reichstag. LaFollette, however, argued that the United States, which had only weak neighbors and was thousands of miles away from any strong states, could well afford the kind of wartime freedom that Germany and Russia had had to pay too dearly for during the war²⁷¹.

Bob was aware that Wilson's insane foreign policy during the war and its aftermath had dashed all his own hopes as far as the immediate future of the United States was concerned. The hidden rule of the plutocratic oligarchy behind a democratic façade had been transformed under Wilson, and Bob could claim with full justification in the Senate that Wilson had "enthroned big business as master of the government". This state of affairs has not changed since 1917. Before Wilson, the United States was defined as an Independent Republic of mixed monarchical-aristocratic-democratic form according to the principles laid down by Montesquieu and copied from him by the American Founding Fathers. A teacher who refused to call the USA a democracy between 1917 and today would automatically have been hounded out of his post.

The crudeness and mendacity of American public education, which has always been a problem to some degree since the system was gradually established in various parts of the country in the 1830s, worsened significantly after Wilson. The level of commanded false propaganda made public schooling seem more and more like a punishment than a privilege - which is also the reason for the rapid disintegration of American public education in our day. With each passing year, it became more painfully obvious that the U.S. had reached a fateful turning point in 1912 and was headed in a wrong direction that could not be reversed. Ergo, discussion of the truth about 1912 was not allowed in American textbooks, and textbook authors who tried did not find publishers. The grip of world Jewry on the US, which had been a major problem even before 1912, was rapidly completed in the years after 1912 by one Jewish dictatorial decree after another, until finally, in the era of Frank Roosevelt, the Jews achieved what they hoped would be a suppression of all real freedom within the US with the "Anti-Defamation League" of B'nai B'rith. So far, these Jewish expectations have been fully realized.

Considering that LaFollette had only 61½ years to live after the Armistice, he indisputably made the most of his few remaining opportunities. Although Congress had rejected the infamous Wilsonian Treaty of Versailles, Bob was deeply concerned about the hopelessly

reactionary Congress of 1920. There is in Sinclair Lewis's novel *Babbalanza* an immortalization of the pathetic type prevalent in that Congress: The average Congressman elected in 1920 was even more complacent, even more corrupt and stupid than had been the case in previous Congresses, and that is saying quite a lot²⁷⁴. The recession of 1921-1923 had only a temporary and very minor sobering effect, and the normal human intelligence was swept away by the great winds of the six-year inflationary boom that began in 1923 and was accelerated in 1927 by the international easy money policy. Although President Warren Harding continued to persecute LaFollette until his mysterious death (by suicide, murder, or natural causes), denying him even the normal say of Senators in appointments to office, Bob easily won his own re-election to the Senate in 1922, while contributing to the defeat of Republican Party candidates in the Congressional elections of that year.

Ten years after Teddy's 1912 betrayal, Bob had come to the correct conclusion that there was nothing more to be hoped for from the Republican Party. It was riddled with corruption and rotten to the core and could never again serve as a vehicle for national renewal in the United States. History has proven Bob's judgment correct, as the GOP remained devoid of any elementary decency from 1922 on. Even Herbert Hoover, the relatively best GOP president between Harding U"l Ford, was incompetent and dishonest in handling the economic crisis of 1929²⁷⁵ ^ But the Republicans' absolute nadir came after 1952, when their leaders were the likes of Ike Eisen- hower, Dick Nixon and Jerry Ford. A seminal analysis by Gary Allen of Stanford University²⁷⁶ contains documentary evidence that Dick Nixon should have been widely recognized as a human failure long before the Watergate scandal of 1972 - which led to his humiliating resignation from the presidency two years later.

Bob LaFollette's response to the new horde of plutocratic evildoers the war had produced - including 15,000 new American millionaires - was to call for reform of the regressive 18th century tax system. While it was absolutely impossible for him to get any legislation passed in this direction in the reactionary twenties, he at least nailed the issue to the Congressional Record in the form of many excellent and enduringly significant Senate speeches²⁷⁷.

Because the Supreme Court, exercising its constitutionally controversial power of review, declared Bob's "Second Child Labor Act" unconstitutional, Bob attended a convention of the American Federation of Labor (AFL) in 1922. He was the father of both the First and Second Child Labor Acts, but was unable to persuade the Supreme Court to

accept them. The plutocrats found the idea that helpless children should no longer be sent to work long shifts in sweatshops and factories intolerable. Bob, in his programmatic speech at the 1922 meeting of the AFL, advocated a long overdue sweeping reform of the American judicial system. The English legal system, with its statutes, common law and equity dating back to the 16th century but still in place in the 20th century, was a corrupt and immoral farce that denied justice to the poor but showered the plutocratic wrongdoers with additional wealth and privilege. This intolerable situation has not changed in the US to this day, and the American Bar Association, like the American Medical Association, functions merely as a lobby to protect corruption and unfair privilege and to fanatically resist any impulse toward decency and modernity^{27B}.

The "Old Man" tries once again to save his country:
the 1924 presidential candidacy

By 1922, it had been 42 years that Bob had served as an elected official (within Wisconsin or from that state), although he was only 67 years old. In his state, he was affectionately known as "Old Man" - just as Frederick the Great was nicknamed "Old Fritz" long before he was really old. George Washington, who had been given the generally accepted title of "Father of his Country" by the German Peter Mühlenberg from Pennsylvania, was not yet old when he died unexpectedly at the age of 66 in 1799.

Finally, in 1922, LaFollette was invited to give his first postwar speech at the University of Wisconsin, where he had been so wildly denounced four years earlier. Well-meaning former students advised him to avoid overly controversial topics - then he would be tolerated. But instead, as soon as he stepped to the podium, he began unabashedly, "I would not trade my achievements in the war with those of any other man, living or dead." ²⁷⁹ Contrary to the expectations of his anxious advisors, Bob's frank and manly speech about the Alpha and Omega of American transgressions over the past decade earned him a thunderous ovation. Bob knew that deep down "the war had been unpopular" ²⁸⁰.

LaFollette's last big political roll of the dice was his independent-progressive presidential candidacy in 1924 - with Burton K. Wheeler as his running mate for the vice-presidency, Senator from Montana and later unabashed in his denunciation of Frank Roosevelt's incessant

warmongering between his Chicago Bridge speech and Pearl Harbor²⁸¹. Their only foreign policy agenda was the abolition of the Treaty of Versailles; their only domestic policy was to break the monopoly of power of the plutocratic oligarchy of the USA. The fact that these two thoroughly decent candidates, Bob and Burt, managed to get over five million votes - almost as many as the Democratic candidate (with a simultaneous landslide victory for the incredibly stupid Republican candidate Calvin Coolidge) - speaks for the eloquence of these hopeless campaigners. Unlike other losers at other times, LaFollette did not indulge in a moment's leisure after his inevitable defeat. Hiram Johnson, who had supported Bob in California, predicted that Bob would be able to reverse the prevailing tide the next time around, in 1928, because his tireless energy was building new momentum for another progressive third party bid. But it was not to be. Bob had no heart history behind him, but in June 1925 he suffered a fatal heart attack - four days before his seventieth birthday. Fighting Bob went down for the first and last time - and his work was unfinished. It staggers the imagination to think what he could have achieved for the USA and all of humanity if he had won the presidency in 1912, which he so richly served²⁸².

Wilson becomes mentally ill; Bernard Baruch as "Eider Statesman "

Unfortunately, the corrupt USA had chosen the leader it^{no} deserved and not one of the true progressives like^e Bob - rather the egotistical, parasitic and arrogant Ber-^{nar}d Baruch. ^{ge}The means Baruch needed to cement his own stranglehold on the neck of the US was the cowardly and criminal entry of the US into the war on April 6, 1917, which he himself had engineered under Wilson's name on March 9, 1917. Baruch was present when Wilson read his war message to Congress on April 2, 1917. With cruel satisfaction, Baruch observed a "LaFollette, rigid and silent, while the applause thundered "²⁸³.

Baruch also recalled that the evening after his speech, Wilson was even more hysterical than one might have guessed, and "cried like a little child. "²⁸⁴ Newton D. Baker was Wilson's Secretary of War, but the man who wielded all the power of that ministry was Ber- nard Baruch, who loved war without ever having fought in one, and had been showering Wilson with general mobilization plans from 1915 onward^{28s}.

Baruch had many irons in the fire, including his close friendship with Samuel Gompers, the Jewish boss of the American Federation of Labor.

Gompers, who had begun his career in the New York Cigar Workers Union, gave the AFL a dubious but lasting position in the 1880s by promising a congressional committee that under his leadership the AFL would remain something of a private enterprise, concerned only with money and unconcerned with political reform. In this way, Gompers set the tone that has been maintained by the crassly materialistic AFL to this day. As a Jew with secretly strong messianic leanings, Gompers was enthusiastic about the immense Jewish power Baruch wielded, and he vowed that the AFL would be entirely at Baruch's disposal - during the war emergency and afterwards²⁸⁶.

Baruch boasted that during the war he had "towered over the other American leaders, including Wilson, like a redwood tree"²⁸⁷. He reminded Wilson that since 1914 munitions production was the key to victory, and that this should be placed in one hand for the duration of the American war effort - and that he himself was the man for the job. The personal profiteering of Baruch and his Jewish Guggenheim allies with their copper monopoly became proverbial. Baruch never denied that he selfishly exploited the American war emergency to vastly increase his already enormous wealth²⁸⁸. And he was not yet satisfied with the power he had acquired. On March 4, 1918, Wilson appointed him chairman of the War Industries Board, legalizing Baruch's enormous dictatorial powers²⁸⁹. Before accepting this official post, Baruch said to Wilson: "I'll do it right if you don't talk me into it", to which Wilson replied: "I won't talk you into it"²⁹⁰.

Wilson finally went mad eighteen months later, but by then the war was over. Baruch's power was never successfully challenged, either during or after the war. For example, Herbert Hoover, Wilson's food expert and later US president, made it his policy never to disagree with Baruch or challenge his supremacy. Harding and Coolidge never dreamed of defying Baruch, nor did Frank Roosevelt, even though he was jealous of Baruch's old intimate friendship with Winston Churchill. FDR and Baruch had known each other since the Baltimore Party Convention of 1912, but they remained political colleagues and social acquaintances rather than true friends forever. Frank Roosevelt was obviously immune to Baruch's charisma, which charmed Winston Churchill and Woody Wilson, but he was also smart enough not to question Baruch's authority as a self-proclaimed American elder statesman²⁹¹.

A fanatical Jew like Baruch loved destructive violence for its own sake. It would have taken an honest popular reform movement to drive him out. Unfortunately, apart from Bob's unsuccessful bid in 1924, there

was no such movement for all the long years after 1912. Today, with the whole rotten structure of the U.S. obviously falling apart, no serious pundit thinks such a reform movement is possible. Even Fighting Bob, America's greatest politician of all time, would be powerless today to stop the disintegration of the USA. To use a vivid expression from aviation: The USA has long since passed the point of no return. The economy is in ruins, national prestige is in tatters, society is a veritable hell of hostile parties, and ethnic groups are at war with each other along the lines laid out by world Jewry in the American Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Immigration Act of 1965. The corruption of Congress and the Supreme Court is proverbial, and the time is past when an American who is sufficiently dishonest to be elected president can still be taken seriously. And all this happened to a country with tremendous natural resources and weak neighbors, a country that could easily have been consolidated on a permanent and decent footing a few decades earlier.

Baroch never lost his taste for death and destruction and in 1944 he was the first advocate of the Morgen Thau Plan, according to which Germany was to be treated so horribly by the West that it would be driven against its will into the waiting arms of Joseph Stalin and Jewish Bolshevism²⁹².

None of these horrors, which were directly related to Bernard Baroch's permanent rule after Wilson's electoral victories, would have been imaginable had Robert M. LaFollette not been cheated out of the leadership of the United States in 1912, which he had worked so diligently to achieve and so richly deserved. Wilson and FDR instead of LaFollette and his supporters - that meant the triumph of the forces of evil over the forces of good in the history of the USA²⁹³.

Chapter Four

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM BEFORE WILSON

The hypocrisy of the slavery issue

It is not doubtful that, along with Wilson, it was traditional corruption in the US from its earliest beginnings¹ that gave Baruch the influence he needed to seize power. Another ingredient - and a particularly important one when one remembers that Baruch consolidated his position by means of an unnecessary war that he personally promoted - was the tradition of US foreign policy dominated by hypocrisy, greed and brutality. The constant element of English-style hypocrisy, combined with the older elements of brutality and greed, emerged with the American Civil War of 1861-1865. William Wilberforce's agitation in England in the 1820s and 1830s in favor of a *de jure* abolition of slavery in the British Empire immediately evoked its counterpart in slavishly Anglophile New England, where the Yankees eagerly emulated England's pose of playing the moral ruler of the UDiverse while committing every conceivable crime against humanity.

When the United States declared its independence in 1776, Dr. Samuel Johnson mockingly asked in England, "How is it that we hear the loudest clamor for freedom from slave drivers of all people?"² Each of the original thirteen states had Negro slaves, 60,000 alone³ in the so-called seven free states north of the Mason-Dixon Line, at a time when the entire population of these seven states was less than 11¼ million⁴. When Wendeli Phillips, the most radical and compassionless of northern abolitionists, was born in 1811, black slavery still existed in each of these so-called free states. But Phillips proclaimed that "the South must be destroyed", including the extermination of its "aristocracy of skin"⁵.

The American Colonization Society, which aimed to resettle all Negroes in the USA to Africa, was founded in 1816 and was later supported for life by James Monroe, Henry Clay and Abe Lincoln, but this

resettlement - which Lincoln was still working frantically on in the last days of his life in 1865 - never came to fruition on a sufficient scale. The tiny country of Liberia in West Africa is all that was achieved. No wonder that many free Negroes in the USA opposed this project of Negro deportation back to Africa from the beginning.

Crusade agitation against the South

Missouri was the first' slave state whose admission to the United States in 1820 led to controversy because of its strategic location as a gateway to the American Far West, which both the South and the Northeast hoped to dominate⁷. The strong and rapid economic growth of the Northeast following the completion of the New York-Erie Canal (1825), which connected American Atlantic ports to the vast inland waterway of the Great Lakes, fueled the greed and economic imperialism of the Northeast at the expense of the South⁸. New England's "anti-slavery crusade"-after eight generations of making its fortune from the slave trade-came into full swing during the 1830s⁹.

The most respected of the Boston abolitionist leaders was Thomas Higginson, whose family owed its entire "rum and nigger fortune" to the slave trade. Higginson, like the two most vociferous agitators Wendell Phillips and William Lloyd Garrison, had a domineering and religiously overzealous Calvinist mother. The theory of abolitionist psychological maladjustment has been convincingly developed in numerous works by the late David Donald, who taught history at Yale and Stanford. Garrison's brother, a product of the same family milieu, became a hopeless drunkard¹¹. Garrison publicly burned the U.S. Constitution of 1789, which legally protected slavery, and in 1831 started the *Liberator*, a propaganda sheet whose sole purpose was to incite a deadly military conflict between the American North and South¹².

The American Anti-Slavery Society, a lobby lavishly funded by the plutocratic miscreants, was formed in the course of 1833 and flooded the mail with an inflammatory torrent of propaganda pamphlets, 175,000 of which were mailed from a single New York post office in July 1835 alone[^]. The tone of this propaganda was repulsive, foul, and above all-threatening. It had the effect of causing the South to suppress the more moderate and orderly abolition movement that had sprung up in its territory^{^M}.

Thanks to this massive propaganda offensive by Garrison, Phillips and the plutocratic evildoers behind them, far more radical politicians-

people like Abe Lincoln entered the US Congress in the 1840s and 1850s than had previously been the case^ The abolitionist Liberty Party made its first appearance in the 1840 election, and its presidential candidate James Birney denigrated both Harrison and Van Buren (the Whig and Democratic candidates), while Garrison denounced the 1789 US Constitution as a "compact with death, an agreement with hell "16.

The founding of the Republican Party

The Liberty Party proved to be a first step toward a successful nationwide anti-slavery party, the Republican Party, which was founded on a fateful day in 1854 in Ripon, Wisconsin, a year before Fighting Bob LaFollette was born in that "Badger" state. Acts of open terrorism were on the agenda of the abolitionist Republicans from the beginning. Garrison met with John Brown in the home of Theodore Parker in 1857, when a local economic depression hit the North but spared the South. This depression did not end until Abe Lincoln successfully unleashed the American Civil War (just as Frank Roosevelt managed to end the Great Depression of 1929-1941 by forcing the reluctant Japanese to retaliate against his own war measures). Brown and his sons and other followers had six months earlier wiped out a peaceful southern Kansas settlement in the justly famous Pottawotamie Creek Massacre. In 1859, Brown and his band, with the support of the Republican Party, invaded Virginia as partisans and captured the army arsenal at Harper's

Ferry Virginia in a futile attempt to spark a mass Negro killing of the white civilian population of Virginia (similar to the smaller Negro revolt of Nat Turner in 1831, in which women and children had been the primary victims). Robert E. Lee and his men were able to capture John Brown, and they hanged him after a trial that was unquestionably fair. But that didn't stop the North from later making "John Brown's Soul goes marching on" its main war chant in its 49-month campaign to destroy the South and desecrate and murder many women and children.

Republicans in the 1850s were happy to harness John Brown and the Beecher family as promoters of their campaign to destroy the South. Henry Ward Beecher, a wealthy Congregationalist minister, openly preached disobedience to all U.S. laws that protected slavery as an institution, and his sister Harriet Beecher Stowe, who knew nothing of the South and had never lived there, produced "Uncle Tom's Cabin" in 1852, one of the crudest and most effective propaganda novels of all

time. No sooner had the Republican Party appeared on the scene than the plutocratic evildoers distributed hundreds of thousands of copies of this novel around the world (it is still widely read today in the US, Europe, the Far East and Africa). During the Civil War, Lincoln, with his usual sadistic humor, told Harriet Beecher Stowe that she was the little woman who made the great war possible. Whether meant facetiously or not, in this case Lincoln was telling the truth¹⁷. The late 1850s saw the irresistible rise of the Republican Party, and James Stewart, a Northern historian, correctly concluded that the South had "every reason" to regard the GOP (Grand Old Party = the boastful self-appellation of the Republicans) "as a direct instrument of abolitionism" ¹⁸ (abolition = abolition). Abe Lincoln, who won the split presidential election of 1860 with only 38 percent of the votes cast, "regarded slavery as a moral perversion," and it was childish of him to demand that the South stand idly by as the enormous dictatorial power of the American presidency passed into his hands[^]. The South, however, after trying to appease the North during three decades of acute crisis, now chose to leave the voluntary Union of 1776 peacefully. Direct universal suffrage with'

The first step was to call for a special federal constitutional body to decide this monumental problem. Stewart concluded that desegregation was indeed the only possible way out^{20^}

Lincoln triggers the Civil War

Self-determination might have triumphed, and the South might have been allowed to leave the defunct Union of 1776 in peace - had only Henry Seward of New York remained the leader of the Republican Party, which position he had held from 1854 to 1860. After the Unionist evildoers hastily replaced him with Lincoln in Chicago in 1860, the latter appointed him Secretary of State of the Union. After Lincoln's inauguration in March 1861 (he had traveled to Washington through hostile Maryland disguised as a woman), Seward recoiled from the possible consequences of a mutual war of annihilation. He went to great lengths to persuade Lincoln to accept the South's secession as a fait accompli. Once the South had left the Union, the rest would be free of slavery. But Lincoln was determined to go to war at any cost, and in this respect he was exactly like Sir Edward Grey in 1914, Woody Wilson in 1917, Lord Halifax in 1939, Josef Stalin in 1940 and Frank Roosevelt in 1941. Lincoln managed to artificially trigger the war in 1861 over Seward's objections. He did this by concentrating a Union army ready to

attack at Fort Sumter in South Carolina. This old fort blocked the harbor of Charleston, South Carolina, which at the time was the second largest city in the South after New Orleans. So in April 1861, the Southern military commander in Charleston, General Pierre Beauregard of Louisiana, had to choose between two options: tolerate the Yankee advance and lose Charleston - or storm the fort while there was still time. Since the decision was ultimately a matter of military strategy, and since all of America knew Beauregard to be a moderate and level-headed man, President Jefferson Davis in Montgomery, Alabama (then the capital of the new Confederate States of America - until Virginia seceded, when Richmond, Virginia became the permanent capital) gave Beauregard sole authority to make the strategic decision about Fort Sumter. Beauregard reluctantly decided to take the fort while there was still time - and Lincoln had his war. The following year, 1862, his naval supremacy put the North in a position to take away the Confederacy's largest city, New Orleans, Beauregard's hometown - so the blow to Fort Sumter may not have saved much, but it would be fatuous to argue that without Fort Sumter, Lincoln would not have gotten his war. There was also the Union base of Fort Pickens on the Florida coast and any number of other places where Lincoln, safely elected to a four-year Union presidency, could provoke the war he so craved. Indeed, Lincoln's electoral victory of November 1860 already made the American Civil War inevitable-in exactly the same way that Lord Halifax's assumption of control of British foreign policy from Prime Minister Chamberlain in October 1938 made World War II virtually inevitable, which Halifax then precipitated in September 1939. Seward, in his desperate effort to stop Lincoln, even tried to distract him with an April 1, 1861 plan for a US war of aggression against the remaining colonial possessions of France and Spain in the Western Hemisphere; but Lincoln immediately scrapped the project, calling it "Seward's April Fool" with his usual humor. Seward never had a real chance to stop Lincoln once the plutocratic evildoers had elevated him to the leadership of the Republican Party. On the other hand, as we know today from published British diplomatic documents, Halifax would not have taken action against Germany despite the outbreak of the limited Polish war had not his brutal threats against France enabled him to intimidate French Prime Minister Daladier and his Foreign Minister Bonnet and thus push France into his - Halifax's - war against the better judgment of its leaders. Bonnet agreed with me in 1965 that it would have been possible for him to intercept Halifax, although he would probably have been murdered afterwards by English agents and Halifax would undoubtedly have

started a campaign with the aim of rendering France harmless. Be that as it may, the slim chance the French had of stopping Halifax in 1939 - the same chance Henry Seward did not have in 1861. The latter tried literally every trick a human brain could devise, but Lincoln - with the backing of American money behind him - got his war. As for personal war guilt, there is one view that cannot be refuted: the war of 1861 would have been unthinkable without Lincoln, and the war of 1939 without Lord Halifax. The determinist historians who deny that individuals can cause wars have been hampered in their research by two factors: 1) a preconceived notion that leads them to accept facts that have not been proven, and 2) a reluctance to apply their theory to careful in-depth research into the roots of specific wars.

The messianic character of American war policy

Once underway, Lincoln's war was waged with the same ruthless and bitter fanaticism and fury that later characterized other wars of aggression by the United States - against Mexico, Spain, the Philippines, Italy, Vichy France, Germany and Japan. Although a similar brutality towards the Indians had been evident from the beginning of American history, 1861 marked the end of the period of foreign wars waged by the USA between 1783 and 1860²¹.

After 1861, all American war policy was characterized by a constant element of self-righteous hypocrisy, combined with chauvinistic and messianic hysteria. General Sherman's senselessly brutal devastation of Georgia and South Carolina (1865) was a kind of prelude to the infamous genocidal war policy of the USA in the 20th century, especially against Japan and Germany. Herbert Hoover lamented in one of his books²² that the Americans were experts in warfare but proved incapable when it came to peacemaking. Unfortunately, however, after 1861 the Americans had forgotten the civilized way of waging war (as it predominantly characterized the German undertakings in the First and Second World Wars under Kaiser Wilhelm II and Adolf Hitler²³). When Thomas Jefferson lamented to his best friend of later years, John Adams, about the "fire bell in the night" (an expression Jefferson used to recall the outbreak of Northern frenzy and aggression against the South that occurred at the time of Missouri's admission to the Union, 1820), he was also expressing his fear of the possibility of an American Civil War, which then in 1865-45 years later-actually devastated the South and ruined the North's honor²⁴.

A fire bell at night was the worst disturbance to anyone's peaceful slumber in early America, and Jefferson-who, for all his hypocritical posturing as an apostle of liberty, owned slaves and dealt roughly with his poor white tenants²⁵ -was a good prophet in general. On his 1787 visit to the German Rhineland (where he complained that the simple peasants knew no Latin when he himself could only converse in English, French and Latin), he recognized that the Rhine and Moselle wines were the best in the world, but his premonition that the Rhenish vines he had imported to America would not thrive on the slopes of his Virginia property also proved accurate. One of Jefferson's Florentine friends, Mazzei, assured him that Tuscan grapes would do well in Virginia - but they were no good either. The German and Italian vines were no more suited to Virginia than the utopian messianic ideas of 18th century Virginia were to Germany or Italy. Unfortunately, it was one of the worst mistakes of the Americans from the beginning that they were afflicted with the messianic delusion that their warmed-over ideology - stemming from the Locke-Montesquieuschen shallow variety of the Anglo-French Enlightenment - was worth re-exporting to Europe, even to the rest of the world, when in reality nothing could have been less true: American ideas have so far become a curse everywhere they have been exported and taken root.

American ideology and world destruction

Instead of focusing on how to save their own crumbling country-wisely advised by Wisconsin's Fighting Bob LaFollette during his forty-five heroic years (1880-1925) in U.S. public life-Americans have only destroyed the world while professing to save it. Far from recognizing this catastrophic truth, Americans insist on making even more misguided efforts where they have already wreaked havoc-from South Africa and Brazil to Germany and Japan-and this American perversity and obtuseness are the inevitable product of the messianic U.S. public school system, with its paranoia and boundlessly inflated idealism that is out of touch with reality.

As long as the US is governed by corrupt mediocrities - better known as Rooseveltian epigones who have populated the US public scene since Frank Roosevelt's death in 1945 without allowing dissent - there will be no change, certainly no improvement. Meanwhile, the same *deus ex machina* that ended the pernicious career of the British Empire after

1945 is still hard at work. The US experienced economic and military decline during the 1970s at the same pace that characterized Britain during Churchill's terrible leadership in the 1940s. The days are numbered when official America will still be able to continue its program of global destruction.

This end of the terrible arrogance and immaturity of a colonial and largely non-civilizable America, presumptuously dictating to the rest of the world, is fast approaching - not because America is waking up, but thanks to the socio-economic, political and military decline of the US. Few still fear today's US armed forces, which have just been defeated twice in Asia and are now being replenished with subversive blacks in all their parts. It is the end that the late T. S. Eliot predicted, and it has come not with a big bang, but with a whimper²⁶. As Eliot's best friend, the late Ezra Pound pointed out²⁷ that, in contrast, the healthy Rome-Berlin axis of 1945 ended with a thunderclap in an artificially induced catastrophe - and not with a whimper.

The purpose of a modern philosophy of history is to see the English-American decline in the 20th century from the perspective of a bird, not a frog. In short, it is the duty of the philosopher of history to be above the situation to be assessed and evaluated, and from this privileged point to lay down useful guidelines for the determined and capable leaders of tomorrow. It is useless "to mourn the decline of the British Empire, or to lament the decline of the American Empire, for both were great evils²⁸ and the world is happy to call them both gone. Both have embodied cruelty, barbarism and the outmoded, the outmoded. They were setbacks and obstacles on the West's path to its own future. To mourn their passing would be the same as mourning the end of the Black Death, the bubonic plague.

The 20th century, even if it was the most blind and murderous The period that will remain in the annals of humanity, similar to the 1st century-in which the decrepit Roman Empire reared its ugly head over the entire Mediterranean region-could carry the seeds of a better future. Rome's great historian Tacitus (who coined the famous phrase of scholarship *sine ira et studio*) had this in mind when he wrote his "Germania".

The beginning of an imperialist US foreign policy
after the Civil War

The transition to the heinous post-Civil War foreign policy of the

United States, which paved the way for the untold global atrocities of Bernard Baruch, Woody Wilson and Frank Roosevelt, is best summarized in Charles Campbell's book "The Transformation of American Foreign Relations 1865-1900"²⁹, although this excellent one-volume work cannot, of course, replace the ten-volume "The American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy",³⁰ which contains some of the best historical analysis by the late Charles Taosill, who, along with Thomas Bailey, was the 20th century's foremost authority on the history of US foreign relations. The essence of Campbell's thesis is that the United States was the most influential diplomat in the 20th century. The essence of Campbell's thesis appears in the foreword by editors R. B. Morris and H. S. Commager. Commager was for many decades a leader in publishing American historical source material for the edification of the American public. Unfortunately, most of this material remained unread. The two editors saw a "major turning point in American foreign policy" after the American Civil War, a departure from the mere simple appropriation of sparsely populated adjacent territories such as Texas and California under the aegis of the Jeffersonian slogan of "Manifest Destiny" (which was a chauvinistic twist on the natural law of the social contract philosophers). This was now abandoned in a revolt against the "anti-colonialism" of the so-called Founding Fathers and turned to the kind of savage imperialism that has characterized English politics since Henry VIII (or even since 1066, if one thinks of the Anglo-Normans' nearly four centuries-long effort to seize all of France; this one English enterprise caused more bloodshed than any other during the Middle Ages in Europe).

The nature, style and *modus vivendi* of the interpretation of this change in American foreign policy are the main theme of D. L. Hoggan's "The Fairy Tale of the New History"³² Unless one is familiar with this material, Michael Connors' work, "The Origins of German Hatred in America", remains incomprehensible. In fact, it is true to say that it was not until 1965 that the mystery was solved as to why the largely German USA became so irrational in its attitude towards Germany in the 20th century, i.e. in its artificial, unnatural hatred of Germany.

The period 1865-1900 saw the most pronounced internal change in the US to date, including the end of the "frontier", the end of the predominantly agrarian economy, the beginning of the age of urbanization, the introduction of mechanized transportation, the modern industrial age in general, the mass production of the automobile - and much, much more. But the same period also saw the fatal and decisive change of emphasis in American foreign policy, a

change that would surely have been halted had LaFollette won in 1912 - instead, it became a permanent change that proved ruinous for America and the entire world. Once the American South was conquered and subjected to fifteen years of cruel and corrupt military occupation, other changes quickly followed, including, in one year 1867, the decisive role of the US in overthrowing the decent and popular regime of the Habsburg Emperor Max in Mexico (which was followed by ten years of chaos and then the corrupt-reactionary dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz from 1877-1911/33) and the cheap purchase of Russian America - also known as Alaska - from Tsar Alexander II.

First destinations: Alaska and Mexico

The Russians brought in the big and easy prey in northern China in the 1860s, after the British imperialists had paved the way by sacking Beijing in 1860 and burning down the fabled Manchu Summer Palace (damage to China: hundreds of millions of dollars). After the success of the last round of brutal British aggression against China, the so-called Tsar Liberator tore up the Treaty of Nerchinsk, which Manchu China had once freely negotiated with the Romanov Tsar Peter the Great and which stipulated that, as compensation for their acquisition of Kamchatka, the Russians were not to allow even a piece of timber to float on the mighty Amur, which, along with the Yangtze and the Huangho, was one of China's main rivers. Now, in the 1860s, the Russians not only occupied the entire lower reaches of the Amur and its estuary, but also advanced through the whole of eastern Manchuria to the border of Korea and established a base on the Pacific Ocean, just 700 miles from Tokyo/Japan, which they arrogantly called "Victory in the East" (Vladivostok). It was the victory of a jackal seizing helpless spoils previously overcome by cruel British imperialism, which had already been joined by greedy Yankee traders who claimed for the US every special right that prostrate China granted to the "foreign devils" (as the Chinese called the English).

Shortly after the assassination of Abe Lincoln, US Secretary of State W. H. Seward persuaded President Johnson and the US Congress to purchase Alaska, and this would have been an even wiser move had Secretary of State J. Buchanan not persuaded President Polk 21 years earlier to cede the American claim to northern Oregon (British Columbia) to England, thus depriving the US of the natural land bridge between Oregon and Alaska. If this had not happened, the spatial connection would not have been lost during the expansion of the USA in

1867.

British diplomatic documents have long revealed that the so-called "Little Englanders" who held sway in British politics around the mid-1840s - such as Cobden, Bright and Melbourne - would never have allowed war to break out over Northern Oregon, which had been jointly administered by the United States and England since 1818. The stark contrast between an America that cowardly and unnecessarily capitulated to mighty England in 1846 and the brutally aggressive American tactics of the same year against a weak and demoralized Mexico earned the United States the reputation it retains to this day: the reputation of being little more than a braggart and cowardly bully. There was nothing heroic about forcing Mexico to give up half of its entire territory (1848) and then taking another large chunk from it five years later - in the Gadsden Purchase of 1853. Nor was it heroic to make common cause with England in Samoa during the 1870s, 1880s and 1890s, or to storm the Queen of Hawaii-contrary to solemn promises not to do so-and bag her brave kingdom. The last stand was made by the natives in the natural fortress of Diamond Head on the island of Oahu - in clear sight of Pearl Harbor, which would one day serve as a decoy for the destruction of the Japanese Empire.

The wars against Spain and Germany

President McKinley acted despicably when he demanded - and received - a declaration of war against Spain from the US Congress in 1898 after the Spanish Queen and her Cortes had already capitulated to the American ultimatum. This crude President Bill McKinley of Ohio, who had put his own wife in an insane asylum, cruelly deceived and mistreated two foreign queens within a year. It was also a rotten thing when Teddy Roosevelt invaded Colombia in 1903 and forcibly seceded its five northwest provinces, later known as Panama - all because the Colombian Senate in Bogota had rejected the shabby offer of money the U.S. had made for the right to build the Panama Canal.

The previous atrocities against the Filipinos in the course of the long and desperate Aguinaldo War³⁴ of 1898-1901 surpassed anything ever committed by Germany, France or Italy in terms of international crimes. In more recent times, only England, Soviet Russia and Israel have equaled the United States in this regard.

The cowardly and brutal American mistreatment of Germany in both world wars is generally acknowledged and needs no special mention.

Both times the American public was fed an irrational and highly emotionalized fear of Germany by vicious propagandists, even though at no time in history had it posed any kind of threat to Britain or the US - all to justify the blood-money profits during the fat years of neutrality (1914-1917; 1939-1941) and the subsequent delusional-horrible American atrocities against Germany in war, especially during and after World War II.

US imperialism from Truman to Nixon

The abyss of American war and foreign policy since 1945-including the military defeats in Korea and Vietnam and the irrational persecution of Arabs in favor of Israel (despite all Christian missionary efforts in Arab countries)-speaks for itself. In short, the USA's war and foreign policy since its defeat in the war against England in 1815 has been uniquely appalling, and indeed presents the USA to the world with the untilgbare image of a brutal coward. And none of this infamy was excusable, justifiable or necessary.

Just like the American efforts of the 1970s to overthrow the South African regime, the 1860s campaign against Emperor Max of Mexico was tragic, as it too was once again aimed at overthrowing a good foreign government in favor of a bad one. It is a historical fact that US foreign interventions have always had the goal of replacing good governments with bad ones. Other examples would be Woody Wilson's successful effort to establish Bolshevism in Russia in 1917, his almost successful attempt to bring Bolshevism to power in Germany in 1918-1919 - an effort in the course of which he was able to overthrow the good government of Kaiser Wilhelm II by means of his cunning so-called open diplomacy. Frank Roosevelt's support of the Lublin Jewish and Polish Communists towards the end of the Second World War instead of the so-called London Poles, Roosevelt's support of Tito instead of Mikhailovic in Yugoslavia, Kennedy's overthrow of the Diern regime in Vietnam, the overthrow of the good Trujillo regime in Santo Domingo and similar events in dozens of other Latin American countries over the years - and much, much more. Having been in the hands of a vile and depraved government itself, the US has never sided with good government in its countless unlawful interventions in the internal affairs of foreign countries, but has always favored bad government without exception - and that is still its policy today.

No example is more evil than Harry Truman's destruction of Arab self-determination in Palestine and his creation of the terrorist state of

Israel by exerting unfair economic pressure on the underdeveloped member states of the UN, thus insuring their defiance against their better judgment. This resulted in an endless succession of brutal, bloody and costly wars designed to keep the underdeveloped Arab regions of the Middle East in a constant state of anxiety in the interests of world Jewry. In terms of both intentions and practical results, Truman's policy throughout his presidency (1945-1953) was one of deliberate genocide against all Arab countries and their populations of over 100000000 people. He did more than any other single individual to disrupt and thwart the development of the Middle East.

The ruthless Eisenhower-Nixon military invasion of Lebanon (1958) to prevent Lebanese self-determination and stability in political union with Syria - an intervention that ultimately culminated in the devastating Lebanese civil war - was a belated product of Truman's policy of anti-Arab genocide.

Truman's genocidal policy towards the Arabs can be compared to his anti-Japanese mass murder of August 1945, when he released all available atomic bombs against Hiroshima and Nagasaki. His Secretary of War Stimson has revealed that Truman would have been only too happy to drop more atomic bombs had he had them. Truman was up for all that, even though Japan had been offering unconditional surrender since December 1944 (excepting only the life of the Emperor) and he, Truman, then accepted those very same nine-month-old Japanese terms in September 1945. Hiroshima was indeed the classic example of a cowardly loudmouth descending on an already defeated enemy, and it is one of the world's most mendacious fairy tales that American soldiers' lives were spared by the atomic bombings. The infantile President Jimmy Carter, who was elected in 1976, repeated this propaganda nonsense in his autobiography³⁵.

Truman may not have been as bloodthirsty as Woody Wilson or Frank Roosevelt, but his policies needlessly cost millions of lives, and that is why this simple little man from Missouri, who had been denied coveted membership in the Ku Klux Klan because of his Jewish^{sc} business partner: but who worked for years in Boss Pendergast's criminal political "machine" in Kansas City Missouri, still ranked a distant third behind American arch-war criminals Woody Wilson and Frank Roosevelt-and this along with Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon. (The latter boasted in his David Frost interviews in 1977 that he had sent Israel all available American military equipment in 1973 to prolong the Israeli-Arab war of that year).

The USA's agent against Emperor Maximilian in the turbulent Mexico of the 1860s was the radical Indian partisan leader Benito Juarez, who had been exiled to Oaxaca, the furthest Indian land, by General de Santa Anna, the hero of Mexican military successes against Spain, France and the USA. Unfortunately, after the humiliating seizure of Mexican territory by the USA (1848 and 1853), radicalism increased in Mexico and in August 1855, insurgent forces overthrew Santa Anna and forced him to flee to Colombia to save his life. When Emperor Max came to power in Mexico eight years later, Santa Anna considered it his patriotic duty to serve him. Max, however, was so concerned with political respectability (he had helped the Italians achieve great political reforms during the 1850s), and the leading Mexican politicians - including Santa Anna - had such a bad reputation since the fall of Spanish rule 40 years earlier, that Max politely but firmly declined Santa Anna's offer³⁶

Benito Juarez, a full-blooded Zapotec, was born in 1806 far away in the Indian corn-growing region of southern Mexico. Orphaned as a baby, he left his uncle's estate at the age of twelve and went to the nearest Indian town of Oaxaca. There, the Spanish Franciscan monks turned their charity towards him, raising and educating him - one reason, as he later said, why he wanted to destroy the Catholic Church in Mexico root and branch. Like his American contemporary Abe Lincoln (1809-1865), he was one of the ugliest men who ever lived, and it was precisely his simplicity that - as with Lincoln and in many other cases - had a magnetic effect on others. This phenomenon was repeated after 1921 with Frank Roosevelt, where polio had turned an outwardly handsome man into an ugly cripple.

Juarez became a clerk in a Spanish judicial office in 1831, a lawyer in 1843 and married a white Spanish woman, Margarita Maza, that year, who readily confirmed that Benito³⁷ was "very simple³⁸". Juarez briefly sat in the Mexican National Congress until the Yankees conquered the capital in 1847. After their advance on land had failed, they came by sea via Vera Cruz. Afterwards, Juarez served as governor of Oaxaca for five corrupt, inflammatory and revolutionary years. When Santa Anna drove him out of the country, he worked in a cigar factory in New Orleans. After the fall of Santa Anna, he returned to his homeland - via Panama and Acapulco, Cortez's old 16th century port^{^^}

Juarez was involved in the radical Mexican constitution of 1857 - the worst of the bad Mexican constitutions - which canceled freedom of movement, business contracts and international treaties and led to the military intervention of the English, Spanish and French a few years later to protect their investments and collect their debts. Juarez was elected President of Mexico in 1861, but the

election was a farce as only a few votes were counted. Juarez confiscated European property and prohibited all debt repayments to Europe⁴¹

Mexico's second largest city, Vera Cruz de la Villa Rica (known as Vera Cruz for short), was occupied by combined Anglo-French-Spanish forces in January 1862. The English and Spanish quickly withdrew after satisfying their demands, but Emperor Napoleon III of France was influenced by a treatise by the most famous contemporary French historian, Guillaume Guizot (1787-1876), who had been French Foreign Minister during the 1840s. Guizot declared that the tyranny of the USA over Latin America was a curse and that Europe should make serious efforts to protect the Ibero-American peoples against the incessant ravages of the imperialist Yankee hawk. The moment seemed favorable: The Civil War was raging in the United States, and virtually no one in Europe except Bismarck and Czar Alexander II expected the North to subjugate the proud and heroic South. Guizot believed that the Monroe Doctrine was nonsense, that there should be a balance of power in the Western Hemisphere to keep the USA in check, just as a similar balance in the Eastern Hemisphere kept Russia in check. Pointing out that the Mexicans were essentially a great people who only needed to be helped to achieve stability and reform from the outside, Napoleon III - with Guizot's enthusiastic approval - persuaded the initially hesitant Maximilian, younger brother of Emperor Franz Joseph of Austria, to lead Mexico into an age of freedom and prosperity. Once he had agreed, Max freely committed his life to establishing order and true freedom in Mexico. Both had been denied to the Mexicans since the end of Spanish rule forty years earlier⁴².

The history of the Monroe Doctrine

The US, however, far from being a friend of its Latin American sister, had treated Mexico from the beginning of its independence like a cat treats a dying mouse⁴², and the last thing the American plutocratic miscreants wanted was Mexico's freedom and the happiness of the Mexican people. These malefactors had hopes of conquering and colonizing all of Mexico once they had conquered and colonized their own southern United States. (The so-called Carpetbaggers in the South after 1865 were Yankee criminals who enriched themselves by perpetuating the North's economic control over the defeated South). The Monroe Doctrine of 1823 had the one greedy purpose of reserving Latin America as colonial territory for U.S. exploitation. The only reason John Quincy Adams persuaded President Monroe not to accept the joint declaration on Latin America offered by England's Prime Minister Canning was the hope that the US would eventually eliminate British imperialism from the Western Hemisphere as well as Spanish, Portuguese, Russian, French, Danish and Dutch

imperialism. However, this had nothing to do with friendly US official feelings towards Latin America - exactly the opposite was the case: it was the explicit and publicly declared goal of the USA (for example in the Ostend Manifesto of the American diplomats in Europe of 1854) to monopolize the imperialist exploitation of the entire Western Hemisphere. After 1898, this goal was extended to include everything that the USA could get hold of in the Eastern Hemisphere.

With the sole exception of the British Empire, never in history - neither in Tang Dynasty China nor in the Roman Empire at the time of Trajan - has there been such voracious, ruthless and hypocritical imperialism as that of the USA^

In the 19th century, England's economic and military power was so great that England - and not the USA - continued to dominate the economy of Latin America during the period of independence in the 19th century, as had already been the case after the Peace of Utrecht and the Assiento system during the last decades of the old Spanish and Portuguese colonial regimes. As the only one of seven European colonial powers in the Western Hemisphere, England continued to expand its colonial territory even after the proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine (1823): it enlarged its colony of Guiana in northern South America and seized the large and strategically located group of Falkland Islands deep in the southern Argentinian lines. England dictated customs policy and other internal measures to the Latin American states, bombarding their ports and sending its troops whenever it felt like collecting dubious debts (payment of usurious interest). The English rulers toyed with plans to annex entire Latin American states, concluding at the last minute that it would be cheaper to exploit such states indirectly (as with the USA after 1783).

English leaders often considered annexing territories coveted by the United States, such as the Kingdom of Hawaii or the Mexican portion of Texas, but even in these cases, English decisions were ultimately driven by practical economic factors. It was only after the mad English attack on Germany in 1914 - known as the First World War - that the British began to liquidate their overseas investments in Latin America and loosen their economic stranglehold on the region. This was precisely the development - albeit only three generations later - that John Quincy Adams had in mind in 1823, when he adopted the pragmatic logic that had become familiar to Americans through England's Thomas Paine since the 1770s. Adams, son of the second US president, was the dominant figure in Monroe's cabinet. He dominated Monroe's two terms in office as well as his own subsequent administration, although like his father, he only served a single term. Andrew Jackson blocked a second presidency of John Quincy Adams just as successfully as Thomas Jefferson had prevented a second term of John Adams. Jackson himself served

two terms, and so the two Adams, father and son, remained the only US presidents between 1789 and 1837 to serve only one term each. All other presidents served the maximum two terms in accordance with a tradition that was only violated by Frank Roosevelt. The latter manipulated both the Democratic and Republican party conventions through secret agents in 1940, so that at a moment when 90 percent of the American people were clamoring for a presidential candidate who would not invade Germany, the only choice was between FDR and Willkie, both of whom intended to plunge the US into war against Germany as quickly as possible, and by whatever crooked means; the whole thing was a cheap ploy by Roosevelt, who throughout his life was dominated by a complete, high-handed contempt for the opinions, wishes and aspirations of the American people.

The long period in which John Quincy Adams had the decisive say in US foreign policy came to an end in 1829 with the inauguration of President Jackson, but Adams was able to pass on his world view to Jacksonians, including Jackson himself and the presidents who followed him, right up to Lincoln, especially with regard to the Monroe Doctrine. This was confirmed by President James Polk's famous Monroe Doctrine Corollary of 1845, which renewed in explicit form the American commitment that there would be no future territorial annexations by the United States in the Eastern Hemisphere - a promise that would be broken fifty-three years later without justification by President McKinley. This corollary goes back entirely to Adams, as did the original doctrine twenty-two years earlier. Adams sat in the U.S. Congress in 1848, the year of his death, and was greatly admired by a young Whig congressman who was also in Congress for only a two-year term: Abe Lincoln of Illinois. Although Adams and Lincoln both criticized President Polk for the unnecessary loss of Northern Oregon (British Columbia) to England, and for acquiring too much Mexican territory on behalf of the South (like Jackson, Polk was a slave owner from Tennessee), both Adams and Lincoln agreed that the "Manifest Destiny" of the United States could be achieved through the power politics contained in the Monroe Doctrine. Lincoln was assassinated in 1865, but he passed on the Adams legacy of the Monroe Doctrine to his vice president and successor, Andrew Johnson - and Johnson was in the White House when Emperor Maximilian was destroyed in 1867.

By 1865, the imperialist Adams-Monroe Doctrine had become a permanent feature of OS foreign policy, comparable to the Florentine-Venetian policy of equilibrium imported to England by Cardinal Wolsey in the 16th century, which was never questioned in Whi- tehall from Cromwell's death in 1658 until the end of World War II in 1945. American policy harmed Latin America, and English policy harmed Europe^

Emperor Max of Mexico, grandson of the last emperor of the thousand-year-old Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, destroyed by France in 1806, arrived in his new capital Mexico City early in 1864. He was accompanied by his wife, the Empress Carlota. Thirty-four years earlier, the former Austrian Netherlands - which had once formed ten of the seventeen provinces of the Burgundian Circle of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation - had successfully revolted against Dutch rule, which had been imposed on them by England at the Congress of Vienna in 1815. The Dutch, with their proverbial tenacity, tried to win back the rebellious provinces for nine years until the "Concert of European Powers" finally intervened in 1839 and forced the Dutch to desist. The now independent country took on the old pre-Christian name of Belgium and also chose a German royal dynasty. Carlota, Empress of Mexico, was the daughter of King Leopold of Belgium. She was 24 and Max 32 when the couple arrived in Mexico City[^]

Although French auxiliary troops, who had been in Mexico since 1862, remained in the country for security reasons even after the debt had been collected, neither Maximilian nor Napoleon III. had the slightest intention of allowing this situation to continue for more than half a dozen years, and all the more so as it became clear to everyone by the middle of 1864 that Max enjoyed greater popular support than any other leader who had ruled Mexico since the first days of its independence. Juarez was hated and reviled everywhere. Since he had no supporters anywhere in Mexico, he fled to a remote camp near El Paso on the US border - and as a result, this desolate place eventually became the gambling and prostitution town of Juarez.

Benito Juarez had lived in the USA, he knew that the Americans hated the idea of a strong and stable Mexico, and so he relied on American money and guns to rekindle the flame of revolution in Mexico, and on American pressure against Napoleon III to force him to renounce his military and diplomatic support of Maximilian. Since Max's country of birth, German Austria, had no ambitions in the Western Hemisphere, a break between Max and France would have completely isolated the Emperor from a Juarez-US alliance. Juarez was like later revolutionary leaders of the ilk of Lenin, Eisner, Bela Kun Cohen and Stalin: the fact that he had no support among the people of Mexico was of no concern to him as long as he could dream of American money and guns to establish and maintain his dictatorship.

After Robert E. Lee's defeat at Gettysburg/Pennsylvania (1863) - whereby the North's losses were greater, but Lee missed a Cannae and was unable to continue the invasion of the North in the face of the opponent's overwhelming

superiority in men and material - after this battle, the fortunes of war in the American Civil War turned against the South, which was blockaded all around, and the outcome was practically decided when Sherman smashed the South's Georgia front in August 1864. The US had the largest land army in the world, and despite inflation, money was plentiful thanks to the progressive confiscation of virtually all private property in the South by the victorious North. Juarez got his share of the spoils from 1864-1866.

The story in Mexico was very similar to that in China during the late 1940s, where US President Harry Truman cut back supplies to National China on the orders of the Rockefellers and their pro-Communist Institute of Pacific Relations, while Joseph Stalin poured huge resources into the murderous Red Chinese partisans, who even as late as 1948 enjoyed little following among the people of China. Guns and money poured from the US into Mexico into the hands of Juarez and his murdering hired partisans, while Napoleon III agreed to withdraw the last French troops in 1866. Carlota traveled to Europe to mobilize public opinion against blatant U.S. imperialism in Mexico, but it was all for naught - too fast and too great was the influx of American aid to Juarez. Maximilian had to spend most of his time on campaign from 1865 onwards, and two years later he lost the decisive battle of Queretaro. It was on this battlefield that Max was captured by partisans of Benito Juarez, and he was shot without trial on June 19, 1867, along with his subordinate military commanders. It was the culmination of a sordid and depraved episode in the annals of US imperialism and remains a disaster for Mexico to this day.

"Juarez", the Jewish Hollywood film from the 1930s, in which the ugly Jew Paul Muni played the ugly pure-blooded Indian Juarez, was a crude, crude and grotesque farce that deliberately presented the world with a total reversal of the historical circumstances of 1867 - just as "Wilson", a Jewish Hollywood light drama from the 1940s, totally distorted the events of 1917-1919. Carlota went mad when she learned the gruesome details of the liquidation of Maximilian and tens of thousands of his followers. She only died sixty years after her husband in 1927.

Ongoing US intervention in neighboring country to the south

Juarez was more of a commissar than a military commander. He therefore entrusted the mestizo Porfirio Diaz with the final victorious campaign against Max, but when Diaz returned in triumph to Mexico City in July 1867, Juarez publicly insulted him out of irrepressible jealousy. Juarez had made generous but empty promises for the coming glory of his own dictatorial rule, before Maximilian was finished, but the more than satisfied U.S. political pundits were

not surprised when none of these promises were kept and Juarez became, according to their expectations, the most brutal and corrupt dictator Mexico had ever known.

When Maximilian was assassinated, Benito Juarez had no legal authority to govern, so he rushed through a special election in 1867, in which hardly any votes were actually counted. His presidency was to end in 1871 in accordance with the radical constitution adopted ten years earlier. Juarez was hated throughout Mexico, and his own cronies advised him not to run again, especially since the popular Diaz had registered his own candidacy. However, the furious Juarez could not be dissuaded from his candidacy.

When he then realized that, despite all his fraud, the vote went against him, he ordered the ballots to be destroyed and had his puppet parliament declare him the winner. Juarez was delighted when Diaz took up arms to challenge this electoral fraud, because with help from the USA, Juarez had long since disarmed Diaz's supporters and built up a huge private army of cutthroats to drown any revolt in blood. Diaz lost in 1871 for lack of arms, but Juarez was so exhausted from five years of nonstop partying, wasting and depravity of every kind that he deteriorated physically and died on July 18, 1872. His most unscrupulous henchman, Sebastian Lerdo, managed to succeed him and hold on to power for three years, but was crushed by Diaz at the beginning of 1876.

The USA feared that Diaz could rebuild Mexico, so regular US forces invaded Mexico in 1877 without a declaration of war and threatened the "Latino" neighbor south of the Rio Grande with extinction forever. Diaz had to pay a huge ransom in the form of oil and mining concessions, otherwise the USA would have wiped Mexico off the world map once and for all. The original good intentions that Diaz had - and compared to Juarez, he was almost a saint - soon evaporated alongside his corrupt dealings with the Americans. In the course of the subsequent long period of Diaz's dictatorship from 1877 to 1911, Mexico - which had experienced a brief dream of freedom and dignity during Maximilian's administration - descended further and further, China-style, to the despicable level of an Anglo-American colonial province. Republican US President Rutherford Hayes hoped that the US alone could enjoy the subjugation and exploitation of Mexico, but the ubiquitous British strongly reminded America that they could exclude the US from the imperialist subjugation and exploitation of China if the Americans did not agree to play second fiddle to England there, despite their leading role in the defeat of Mexico. By the end of the Diaz era, 50 percent of American foreign investment was placed in Mexico, and this money brought rich rewards to its American investors at the expense of the Mexican people, but England was far ahead of the United States financially when radical reformers led by Francisco Maderos

overthrew Diaz on June 7, 1911. After the Republican Taft administration successfully engineered Madero's assassination, the stage was set for Woody Wilson's incredible aggression against Mexico, which began in 1913⁵⁰.

The American delusion of superiority

Cruel American aggression went hand in hand with smug hypocrisy, the English way. Campbell is credited with summarizing the official American worldview of the post-Civil War generation: "Outside the New World, everything seemed comparatively bleak. Africa was hopelessly backward, Asia decadent. And even Europe - to which America paid more attention than to any other overseas territory - was outdated, even if its culture still commanded respect⁵¹. " Official America suffered from the absurd self-delusion that "the droves of immigrants from Europe . . . clearly demonstrated American superiority," which was nothing more than the assertion that the emigration of Europeans to Borneo entitled the headhunters there to consider their system superior to the European one - which they, like the Americans, no doubt sincerely believed⁵²^ (In reality, the emigration from Europe to America was a kind of osmosis, brought about by the incomparably greater population density in Europe - a self-evident fact that never entered the minds of American political leaders). In view of this delusion of superiority, it is all the more remarkable that from the Civil War onwards, the dirigiste American compulsory school system hammered into the oppressed, exploited American masses that the USA and its swollen national territory were constantly in danger⁵³^.

More than a generation of this influence and brainwashing had already passed when President McKinley hounded the ignorant American people into war against Spain in 1898-under the absurd pretext that the legendary Spanish galleons were preparing to invade New York City. The nation's mental degeneration was even more abysmal in 1917, when Woody Wilson shooed it into war against encircled Germany-this time with the psychotic claim that the Germans were preparing to invade the USA via Mexico. But the absolute nadir of American popular psychosis was reached in 1940, when Frank Roosevelt dared to lie to the ignorant American masses that "Dakar is a dagger pointed at the heart of Brazil" and that Germany - though hemmed in by the blockade of the mighty British fleet - was preparing to invade Iowa via Dakar, Rio de Janeiro and Mexico City. FDR was guilty of the most cynical political grandstanding the year before when he claimed that the US was the best-informed country in the world. The exact opposite was the case. Even primitive peoples in their information poverty had a much more realistic world view than Americans, who had been stuffed full of vulgar disinformation by Jewish-

directed mass media and educational institutions.

Chauvinism and a sense of mission

In strictly scientific and historical terms, the USA was already mentally disturbed at birth⁵⁴, but after the Civil War of 1861-1865 its condition became that of a permanent chauvinistic psychosis combined with an intellectual paralysis in which all contact with the real world of the 19th and 20th centuries was lost. The absurdity of such an uneducated and thoroughly sick nation aspiring to world leadership speaks for itself, and it should not surprise the observer that the rise and fall of the USA has been far more rapid than the rise and fall of the British Empire. The sophisticated British leaders did not often believe their own propaganda lies, while the uneducated US leaders of the immature Woody Wilson and Frank Roosevelt ilk managed to fall victim to their own lying propaganda - with the result that they made more mistakes than any British Prime Minister (with the exception of Churchill, whose mother was American⁵⁵).

As for the American acquisition of Alaska,⁵⁶ Campbell proved that the most effective argument in 1867 in favor of this purchase was this: Alaska could be used to "hasten Queen Victoria's departure from Canada." Most US citizens of the time literally believed that the US would annex every square mile of North America and neighboring islands in the near future - an area half the size of the Russian Empire - and many even thought the US would annex all of South America as well. So much for the false propaganda that the Monroe Doctrine had taught Americans to respect their neighbors within the Western Hemisphere!

The arrogance with which the USA treated Tsar Alexander II in the Alaska affair is also typical. No sooner had the treaty of sale been signed in 1867 than US forces rushed to Alaska and grossly mistreated the Russian population there, but the US Congress took a year before approving the modest payment of 7.2 million dollars to Russia agreed in the treaty on July 14, 1868. The American Secretary of State Seward, who called himself a Hegelian because he had memorized a few sentences from the notes of Hegel's Berlin students, proudly proclaimed after the Russian negotiations of 1867: "The Empire has been moving steadily westward for the last three hundred years and ...must continue in this direction until the waves of the rejuvenated and decaying civilizations of the world meet on the shores of the Pacific Ocean."⁵⁸ No sooner had he got the Alaska Treaty safely out of the water than Seward publicly predicted that one day there would be a war to the death between Russia and the USA on the plains of Manchuria - a struggle for dominion over the entire globe⁵⁹. You see, thanks to the success of Lincoln's shameful and persistent aggression against the

southern United States, the once moderate and reasonable Seward had become a chauvinistic fool. The matter was all the more remarkable because Russia, along with Prussia, were the only foreign states that had been friendly to the Union in the Civil War that had just ended two years earlier.

Seward boasted that of all the nations of the world, the US was the "most rejuvenated" and China the "most withered."60 Today, this has an ironic flavor given the US military defeats in Korea and Vietnam, with the "rejuvenated" China driving the "withered" Americans out of the countries of the Far East. Seward's New York Yankee disdain for China was reinforced by the huge profits reaped there by American merchants under the unfair, unequal treaties imposed on humiliated China by militarily victorious England' en61. The Yankee merchants demanded and received the same economic privileges as England at the expense of Chinese sovereignty in the 19th and into the 20th century, and not even in 1924, when the US renounced further compensation payments from the Boxer Rebellion of 1900 (because the Russians had also renounced), was there genuine American friendship towards China - but the American plutocratic evildoers hid behind a shameful façade of feigned friendship just to make it easier to exploit these regions. Very few American Christian missionaries took offense at the US role in Latin America and Asia, playing the rapacious jackal in the wake of British imperialism. Kenyatta of Kenya's remark that the British sent missionaries to teach Christian prayers, but while the people were praying, their land was being stolen - this was equally true of the American establishment's spiritual contingent.

But English acquiescence to the Yankee exploiter in China was not pure altruism either. Apart from their usual policy of having as many accomplices as possible in their crimes, the British always reserved the right to demand a price for their generosity. When they demanded payment, the US paid from 1898 onwards in the form of the appalling "open door diplomacy" of OS Secretary of State (and one-time Lincoln's private secretary) John Hay, who pretended to advocate a free trade system that would be beneficial to China. In reality, however, modern mercantilism as practiced by England against China, with its control over China's tariffs, regulations on China's production and consumption of goods, and the stationing of British troops and courts martial throughout China, was far worse and more brutal than the mercantilism against which the Americans had rebelled in 1775. Hay knew this well, and so the sole purpose of American diplomacy in China could only be to perpetuate British crimes in the region in order to keep the Chinese in a state of permanent slavery62^

After the Civil War victory
, the Union clashes with England

The "Alabama" case lays Zellgois for the American euphoria and rapacity following the surrender of the South in 1865 - a kind of prelude to the even uglier global imperialism eighty years later in the wake of the capitulations of Italy, Germany, Japan and their allies Finland, Hungary, Romania, Croatia, Slovakia, Wang China and Vichy France. There would certainly have been a third war between England and the USA during the 1870s if the Republican leader in the US Senate, Charles Sumner from Massachusetts, had been Secretary of State in President Grant's administration (1869-1877), and not Hamilton Fish, the Anglophile former senator and governor of New York. In thunderous Senate speeches, Sumner demanded that England pay the total cost of the last two years of the Civil War-billions of dollars-or there would be war. Sumner publicly boasted that the USA could take all of Canada as part payment. The situation was further complicated by the fact that William Gladstone had been British Prime Minister from 1868 to 1874. As Speaker of the House of Commons in 1862 and 1863, Gladstone had advocated full diplomatic recognition of the Confederate States of America by England and open military intervention against the Yankees of the kind France had undertaken against England eighty years earlier during the American Revolutionary War6J.

The same John Temple, who had refused to assist the Danes militarily against the Austro-Prussian liberation of the German Schleswig-Holstein, was English Prime Minister at the time of the American Civil War. He had a cynical contempt for both the North and the South of the USA and had only one motivation for his policy in this conflict: to extract as much blood-money as possible for England. This included prolonging the war by any means necessary without involving England directly in the fighting.

Almost half of all the war material used by the North was manufactured in England, and much of it was brought to the USA on British ships. But lest this one-sided policy lead too quickly to the South being overwhelmed, Palmerston built first-class warships for the South to ambush the Yankee maritime trade - which had the double advantage of increasing the profit on arms shipments on British ships and also prolonging the war itself. The South paid for these privateers with cotton - most famously the Alabama because of the enormous number of Yankee ships it sank - but the officers and crew were well-paid English fighters in Confederate uniforms. Fearing that the North might turn this practice into a legal dispute, Palmerston had the British crown attorneys prepare expert reports proving that the North, in its fight against the South, was violating the rules of international law of naval warfare as laid down in the 1856 Treaty of Paris that had ended the Anglo-French aggressive Crimean War against Russia.

Lincoln and international law

The most blatant and persistent violation of international law of naval warfare resulted from the Yankee doctrine of so-called continuous voyage - a doctrine that had been explicitly condemned in Paris. For example, the Yankees repeatedly confiscated cargo from European ports to the British Bahamas as "contraband" based on the unproven claim that this cargo was ultimately destined for the Confederate States. One can easily imagine that this unlawful practice caused total chaos in international trade. Abe Lincoln, however, told his Secretary of State, Seward, and his Secretary of War, Stanton, that he did not care about the international law of naval warfare because he was only suppressing a domestic rebellion. This outrageous argument was conveyed by Seward to the diplomatic corps. Lincoln ignored the *de facto* status of the Confederate States as belligerents under the prevailing international law, and he also ignored the explicitly stated fact that the rules of international maritime law should apply not only to regions subject to conventional interstate law, but also to areas where revolutions and civil wars were taking place. Palmerston was pleased about Lincoln's violations of international law - if only because of the *stare decisis* (later possible recourse to these cases) that came into play - and about the difficulties the Americans would encounter in the next English naval war if they were to hastily try again with the maritime law argument that had preceded their declaration of war on England in June 1862. Because Lincoln had deliberately placed the United States outside international law between 1861 and 1865, he destroyed any basis for taking legal countermeasures against subsequent violations of the law by foreign states - for example, when the British were "authoring and manning" ships for the Confederates.

What would have happened if Lincoln and Palmerston had not died in the same year, 1865, remains mere speculation, but presidential memoranda suggest that Lincoln would have backed down. Leaving aside the acquisition of Alaska, the threat to Canada, the expulsion of the French from Mexico, the supply of Juarez's partisans and the destruction of Emperor Maximilian, it can be said that now that Lincoln had disappeared from the scene, the US Republican Congress temporarily put the brakes on a worldwide aggressive foreign policy, especially with regard to England. Indeed, the main goal of Congress during the Johnson administration of 1865-1869 was to tighten its stranglehold on the defeated South, to reduce the power of the US presidency (which Lincoln had expanded into a veritable Cromwellian dictatorship through gross overreach), and, if possible, to drive Lincoln's successor Andy Johnson out of office in disgrace. The Republican radicals had no trouble getting Johnson impeached on bogus charges by a majority vote in the House of Representatives, but they needed two-thirds of the votes to convict in the Senate, and the last-minute "overturning" of a Kansas vote robbed them of that extra victory.

No sooner had Johnson completed his one and only presidential term, despite fierce vituperation, than Charles Sumner - the all-powerful Senate leader who had taken the lead in the Civil War agitation in Congress during the 1850s - concentrated on a sharp verbal attack against England. In 1867, the British House of Commons had hastily passed a law granting the Crown Colony of Canada the status of an autonomous so-called Dominion - in the hope of gaining some support among the local population against the feared military invasion by the Yankees. Nevertheless, Sumner now suggested that the USA should occupy the whole of Canada, including the French parts, if England did not fully satisfy the USA's financial demands. Sumner's chauvinism was all the more ridiculous when one considers that the military importance of the English arms supplies to the North far exceeded the damage done by Palmerston's privateers to the South. In fact, it can be said that if England had only placed an embargo on all arms shipments to North America in 1861, instead of going for blood money, then the South, and not the North, would undoubtedly have won the Civil War - just as Germany would have defeated England and France in the First World War in 1915 without the American blood money arms trade.

President Ulysses Grant was a drunken figurehead from 1869 to 1877. Lincoln joked during the Civil War that Grant's brand of liquor should be issued to all Union generals to strengthen their fighting spirit. Grant's foreign policy incursions after 1869 were limited to the annexation of Santo Domingo, where he hoped to become personally wealthy through land ownership. Although not without great difficulty, Fish finally managed to stop this disgraceful plan. Grant also heavily favored Prussia over France during the War of 1870-1871 because his leading European diplomats - the New England-born pro-German historians John L. Motley and George Bancroft - had told him much about the importance of Bismarck's favoring the North over the South in the American Civil War. Grant spoke so bluntly in favor of Prussia in 1870 that Victor Hugo⁶⁴ attacked him personally, accusing him of insulting the honor of France and vowing that the French would one day get revenge for American perfidy.

Grant was willing to take action on the "Alabama" claims one way or another. He certainly would not have hesitated to order the invasion of Canada or to wage war against England had Sumner rather than Fish been his Secretary of State in 1870⁶⁵. Thanks to Sumner's overwhelming strength in the US Congress, there were chauvinistic and extravagant US claims against England during Grant's presidency, and it depended crucially on the personality of the Secretary of State whether there would be the widely expected third Anglo-American War in 1870. Hamilton Fish was the only member of Grant's cabinet to remain in his post for the entire eight years of this turbulent and messy

presidency. Fish's strong personality and Anglophilia played a crucial role in keeping the peace when all signs pointed to a new Anglo-American war. Such a conflict would very likely have been a blessing for the world by parting England and America's ways. The third war did not happen, but thirty years later the USA became what John Quincy Adams had always feared: a mere dinghy in the wake of the British warship. John Hay's China policy from 1898 onwards was just one example of this. The USA - the "unruly cousin Jonathan" of English political caricatures - became an apish imitator of the style and abominations of decadent English imperialism from 1898 onwards⁶^

The arrangement with imperialist England

Fish showed cunning and skill in manipulating President Grant in 1870. He first skillfully and successfully appealed to Senator Sumner's vanity and persuaded him to take an initiative in the Senate that led to the formal rejection of Grant's plans to annex Santo Domingo. Sumner's success against Grant was in June 1870, and the US President had to see the big money slip out of his dirty and rapacious hands thanks to Sumner's initiative, thus infuriating Sumner "Grant, who had set his heart on the acquisition of this countryc^

Fish then hastened to exploit Grant's anger against Sumner. John Motley, the American ambassador in London - known to Bismarck from their studies together in Göttingen and a lifelong friend (the volumes of their published letters prove it) - Motley had thus promised Sumner that he would do his utmost to put England under maximum pressure in the matter of the "Alabama" claims - and Foreign Minister Fish knew this. George Bancroft, US ambassador in Berlin, shared Motley's enthusiasm for the growing power of Prussia and the desire to clip the wings of arrogant England. Motley and Bancroft were the two leading American historians after Francis Parkman's death. Neither Bancroft's multi-volume history of the American War of Independence against England, nor Motley's multi-volume history of the Dutch War of Independence against Spain in the 16th century have ever been surpassed. But Motley and Bancroft also had the greatest prestige among American diplomats of their time. Fish knew that Motley was a thorn in the side of the hypocritically pious and deceptively liberal Prime Minister Gladstone, who was no match for Motley's biting wit and sarcasm. Ergo, Fish persuaded his president to replace Motley with Robert Schenck, a drunken plutocratic miscreant whose main achievement in London was teaching his English drinking buddies popular American card games, such as stud poker.

No sooner had Fish recalled Motley and filled Grant with inextinguishable hatred of Sumner than he quickly and secretly assured Gladstone that the US would be satisfied with a sham solution to the "Alabama" issue and would under no circumstances take military action against Canada - as long as he, Fish,

remained Secretary of State, and he had secured that post by the break between Grant and Sumner. When the American branch of Irish Sinn Fein invaded Canada on its own initiative from the USA in 1870 to spark a Canadian popular uprising against the autocratic London authorities, Fish savagely beat up the Irish to impress Gladstone. The Russians simultaneously took advantage of the Franco-Prussian War to unilaterally abrogate the anti-Russian Black Sea demilitarization clauses of the 1856 Treaty of Paris under his protection. Gladstone planned retaliatory measures against Russia, but left office in 1874, and it was his main domestic rival, the unscrupulous Tory Jew Benjamin Disraeli⁶⁸, who brought about the renewed humiliation of Russia in 1877-1878. In the meantime, it was the cooperation between Fish and Gladstone against the hated Irish on the one hand, and Gladstone's involvement in the Russian problem on the other, which brought about the desired détente between the USA and England. Gladstone's parliamentary First Lord of the Admiralty was able to inform the sea lord on November 19, 1879 that there would be no third Anglo-American war in the immediate future⁶⁹

The news that a joint British-American high commission would convene and mediate in the "Alabama" matter infuriated Sumner, who announced in the US Senate on January 17, 1871 that the USA "must have Canada" and "To settle the dispute completely, (the British) shall withdraw from this hemisphere, including all provinces and islands. On January 17, 1871, he announced in the U.S. Senate that the United States "must have Canada" and that "to settle the dispute completely, (the British) shall withdraw from this hemisphere, including all provinces and islands." ⁷⁰ Sumner was still secure in his position as chairman of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but Fish ignored his statements and moved quickly toward a settlement with England. Fish led the American delegation when the mediators met in Washington, D. C. in February 1871. C. in February 1871, while Gladstone, aware that Fish was playing the British game, sent only an unknown low-level official to head the British delegation to the United States, which Gladstone had hoped to destroy six years earlier⁷¹.

Economic consequences of the civil war

The "Alabama" controversy (1865-1872) was reduced from a mountain range to a molehill when Fish finally agreed to an English indemnity payment that amounted to less than 0.01 percent of those enormous blood-money profits Palmerston had reaped from the American calamity of 1861-1865. This bloody war, the costliest and most destructive the world had yet seen, not only slaughtered the flowering of American youth, but also enabled the plutocratic malefactors to further entrench their oligarchic monopoly over the political and socioeconomic life of the country and retard the overall economic development

of the United States for a full decade. For nearly a century, the fairy tale that the butchery and corruption of the Civil War had accelerated the industrialization of the United States was believed until Thomas Cochran⁷² and other historians exploded this legend - in the same way, incidentally, that modern French economic historians have put an end to the fairy tale that France, the richest country on earth in 1789, was not prosperous when the Illuminati (known in France as the Jacobins) launched the so-called Great French Revolution. Modern statistical research proved that American industrial development was slowed considerably by the war and that the war was an evil for all segments of the population - except the small group of plutocratic miscreants who promoted it in the first place. Most certainly the Civil War proved to be bad in the long run, especially for the American Negroes.

None of the lavish carpetbagger promises to the Negro population were remembered when Union troops were withdrawn from the South in 1877 because the real purpose of the military occupation had been accomplished: forever was the South economically harnessed to the financial and industrial carts of the plutocratic miscreants from the North. No one cared anymore about the promise of the Radical Republicans' Freedmen's Bureau that each freed black head of family would receive a minimum of 40 acres of land and a mule. Most Negroes remained landless small sharecroppers for forty years after the end of Union occupation. Prof. Artbur M. Schlesinger Sr. of Harvard (who, unlike his more famous but superficially pro-FDR son A. M. Schlesinger Jr. was an intellectual historian of the first rank) hit the nail on the head with the remark that before 1865 the South had said to the Negro, "Be a slave-and God bless you!"-but after 1877, "Be free-and God help you!"⁷³

Fish shattered the illusion of Sumner and the other agitators (who had brought about the war) that by blackmailing England - which was extremely vulnerable despite its worldwide naval supremacy in Canada - part of the huge war costs could be recouped afterwards. It must be remembered: The North, and not the South, suffered the economic crisis of 1857 that so decisively helped the agitators bring on the war less than four years later, but that depression was minor compared to the terrible hardship of the American economic crises of 1873 and 1893. The former occurred within eight years of the end of the war, and the U.S. had not yet recovered from it when the latter struck twenty years later. Most of the inflationary period between the 1898 war with Spain and Black Thursday of October 1929-a period of thirty-one years-was a period of prosperity for the few plutocratic malefactors, but real wages fell in the United States between 1898 and 1914, and the fifteen years 1914-1929, somewhat more favorable to the little man, were followed by the twelve-year Great Depression of 1929-1941, which Frank Roosevelt could not end except by the treacherous expedient of world war policy.

There has never been any serious disagreement among economists and historians that conditions overall were much worse for the American farmer during the three generations following the end of the war in 1865 than during the three preceding generations - and that this is the reason why the mass of the rural population, which had once been the backbone of American conservatism, now supported the extreme radicalism of populism during the 1880s and 1890s. The fairy tale later propagated by federal judge Robert Jitckson⁷⁴ that all revolutions benefit humanity is a sordid and perverse superstition without any factual basis. The American Civil War was an exclusive evil, and the scientific historian can prove the same of countless other violent upheavals, civil wars included. The most outstanding example of a revolution that was clearly an evil and a supreme crime is the Jewish-Bolshevik revolution that destroyed Russia in 1917^{75^}.

Plans for aggression against the Spanish possessions

A side effect of the Treaty of Washington of 1871 - which provided for the Geneva arbitration negotiations of the following year and thus a small financial gain for the USA - was the further provision that the German Kaiser Wilhelm I should make an arbitration award in the dispute over the San Juan Islands between England and the USA. The Kaiser gave the archipelago to the USA in 1872^{76^} Admittedly, these islands formed less than 0.1 percent of the territory of Northern Oregon (British Columbia), which would have been available to the USA without a shot of powder had President Polk not surrendered the entire region to England in 1846, while the USA concentrated on acquiring half of Mexico^{77^}.

The US position on the "Alabama" claims, as publicly stated by Senator Sumner and Bancroft Davis (the leading US technical expert on the matter), was publicly described by England's Prime Minister Gladstone as "almost madness"[^] The exact amount was determined in Geneva by an arbitration tribunal chaired by an Anglophile Italian. The 15.5 million dollars in damages determined was a trifle compared to the cost of the war since the Battle of Gettysburg plus 7 percent interest-which Sumner and Davis demanded. Most astonishing, however, was the fact that immediately after the meager result was announced, the English representative Sir Cockburn called the sum excessive, reserved for a sovereign England the right to reject any award, and refused to sign the agreement. Once again, the English had proved that they were not only experts at collecting, but also experts at not paying. Queen Victoria was delighted by Cockburn's insolence. Although Grant and Fish dropped the matter and England accepted the U.S. presence in the unimportant San Juan Islands, U.S.-English relations^v were strained by a host of specific disputes until 1887, when the highly anglophile President Harrison put a stop to it by taking a few

fishing^{ra} claims to arbitration and abandoning all other American claims⁷⁹ .

A^u n all of Spain's remaining ^{possessions} in the Western Hemisphere, the USA had already^{Auge} many years before the Civil War. The leading OS diplomats in Europe had predicted very accurately in their^{rem} "Ostend Manifesto" of 1854 - and the consequences were to prove it - that the USA would one day acquire Cuba from Spain and would not tolerate any European interference. Thomas Jefferson had already spoken publicly in the 18th century of the USA's interest in acquiring Cuba. After all, at the time of the Yankee insolence of Ostend in 1854, Cuba was called the "ever faithful island" in Spain. (Some consideration was probably given in Europe to the fact that Ostend was at that time the preferred place of recreation and entertainment for OS diplomats). Cuba had been the base for the Spanish conquest of Mexico under Fernando Cortez in 1519, and the island had remained loyal to Spain without a murmur, even when Spanish mainland colonies from California to Argentina revolted hysterically at Anglo-American instigation during the 1820s. World Jewry, however, hated Spain for expelling the Jews from the Iberian Peninsula in the 1490s-at a time when the Jews had also been banished from England for two hundred years-and the House of Rothschild, grateful to England for allowing Cromwell to return the Jews to England after four centuries around the middle of the 17th century, wanted an end to Spanish mercantilist control of Cuba. August Belmont, a Jew who had done rooting work in Cuba as a Rothschild agent before entering the United States and becoming chairman of the Democratic Party of the North in 1861-this was during the confusion following the sudden death of Stephen Douglas of Illinois, the "Little Giant" who had defeated Lincoln in five public debates during the 1858 Senate campaign-so this Belmont supported everything that had been said about Cuba by Thomas Jefferson and in Ostend. But although Belmont was in a very influential position after 1861, Cuba still had to wait - first until after the destruction of the U.S. South, then after the defeat of Emperor Maximilian and Mexico. These two results had only just been achieved when the "ever-loyal island" flared up in sudden revolution in 1868 thanks to US agents^{80^}

As Campbell nicely puts it: after the USA had once again subjugated Mexico in 1867, they wanted to eliminate Spain from the Western Hemisphere once and for all, and that meant not only taking Cuba away from the Spanish, but also another rich, large and profitable sugar island, namely Puerto Rico⁸¹ . This was annexed by the USA in 1898 without there having been a revolt there. The annexation gave the lie to the myth that the Yankees were interested in the self-determination of the "Latinos".

The extermination of the Indians

The constant aggression and simultaneous messianic euphoria of American

foreign policy from its beginnings in 1776 to the present day was and is a disgusting phenomenon, and all the more so when one remembers that up until 1890 the USA cold-bloodedly exterminated the real Americans, namely the Indians, whose original population was reduced by more than 90 percent by the American "final solution to the Indian question". In most cases, the US Congress did not even bother to ratify the treaties concluded for the purpose of confiscating Indian land - as the Indian Court of Pit River in California proved once again in 1978. This can be roughly compared to the 80 percent extermination of the Polynesian Maoris of New Zealand by the British during the terrible decade of man slaughter after 1840. Although the last regular Indian war took place in 1890, the Indian population continued to decline until the 1920 census because Indians continued to be killed en masse with impunity, and because the U.S. policy of desecration of all surviving Indian women continued - to which it can be attributed that today barely 20 percent of all Indians in the U.S. are racially unmixed. The Indians who survived after 1920 had, with very few exceptions, lost all semblance of freedom and self-respect, despite the fine traditions of living together in their Stone Age culture. The wild and proud Indians of the novels of Karl May and James Fenimore Cooper belong only to the legends of the past. And all this despite the fact that there would have been enough land for the Indians to live and thrive in "apartheid".

There is no more gruesome thing in all of world history than the savage American campaign of attrition against the Indians, and in all of this intoxicatingly inflated idealism and messianic nonsense in US foreign policy, the great mass of Americans - not to mention the Indians - remained oppressed, exploited^{bcu} and deceived by their criminal political leaders who had only i^{en} interest: to serve the crude American Pluto oligarchy^{nen8} 2. In the light of such facts, US foreign policy offers a^{sc} spectacle that has long since become a curse for all humanity.

Wilson's and FDR's foreign policy
was based on "a much older tradition

Indeed: Quite apart from the grotesque image of a crazily corrupt, underachieving and egregiously wasteful America, whose 4.8 percent of the earth's population consumes 30 percent of the world's energy production, U.S. foreign policy in the days of Woody Wilson and Frank Roosevelt became the single most significant factor driving the world toward a final suicidal destruction, and there has not been an iota of repentance or improvement among the epigones of these men who have ruled in dictatorial fashion since 1945. Worst of all, no dissent from the hateful legacy of Wilson and FDR has been tolerated since Harry Truman declared his false Cold War emergency in 1947.

Any opposition to the American Wilson-FDR Leviathan has been ruthlessly crushed by every evil means imaginable. It would be nice to imagine that the shameful crimes of Wilson and FDR occurred in some historical vacuum - but the truth is: all these crimes were based on the old rotten traditions of American foreign policy.

The fact is that both Wilson and FDR were colorless mediocrities, except for their appalling psychotic habits, including their insatiable sexuality and their aggressiveness toward most of their male associates. They were both plagiarists and puppet-like stooges, incapable of being at the beginning of a new tradition - good or bad. They merely inserted themselves into a bad tradition, which they exacerbated at the behest of the plutocratic miscreants who were their masters - men like Bernard Baruch and Henry Morgenthau, Jr.

The evildoers have made docile Americans feel like true individualists just because they make a racket at baseball games and run red lights with their cars, which they worship more than any religious shrine. The average American has^s never minded hearing an unscrupulous millionaire plutocrat like Bing Crosby sing: "I know where roses bloom and fragrance fills di^e air! That's why I'll never be a millionaire!"⁸³ The entire^e US scene, so conspicuously devoid of any culture of its own, is so obviously false, artificial and superficial, and communication between citizens is limited to a myriad of lies - including the most disgusting of all, that the US is a so-called democracy, under the rule of its small, secretive and totally authoritarian plutocratic oligarchy.

Because Wilson and FDR were plagiaristic mediocrities, the global catastrophe of the 20th century wrought under their aegis must be approached from the depths of an analytical and developmental perspective. Although the inherent corruption of US political and socio-economic life is the most important aspect of this perspective, the accumulated legacy of US foreign policy comes right behind it.

Interference in Cuba and aggression against Colombia

Grant was a Republican presidential candidate when the Cuban Insurrection broke out in 1868. The force of 50,000 men that Grant had sent to the Mexican border as army commander under President Johnson in 1865 to threaten both Maximilian and Napoleon III with war had been withdrawn, but all the former Confederate states except Texas were still under Union military occupation. (There is a Texas legend that Grant was afraid to occupy Texas, but in reality Grant had told Johnson that it was neither militarily nor economically feasible to occupy the "Jack Rabbit Republic" of Texas⁸⁴.) No sooner had Grant won the 1868 election than the Rothschild Cuban cliques in New York demanded an

American invasion of Cuba, but Grant accused August Belmont and his Democrats of being a party "of treason and apostasy" His campaign against them was so blindly fanatical that he automatically opposed everything they advocated, including the invasion of Cuba - and this despite the trouble the Rothschilds had gone to in organizing the insurrection there. Thanks to the support Grant received from Fish in this matter, another thirty years passed before the USA actually took Cuba. The first Cuban uprising against Spain festered for a decade and^{ver} came to nothing. It is true that John Rawlins, a crony of Grant's in the n^{Sat} o Domingo affair and appointed Secretary of War in 1869, favored an inva^{sion} of Cuba in 1873 and¹⁸⁷⁴ when Grant was safely past his first term, but Fish continued to oppose the war - And he dominated both Grant and the Cabinet^

During Grant's second term, Fish had his hands full trying to prevent a war between the USA and Spain. The Spanish had known from the beginning that the U.S. was not only the source of the Cuban insurrection, but also the country of origin of all the rebels' armaments, and in November 1873 they launched the *Virginius*, a private American ship loaded with weapons for the rebels. Spain hoped to hasten the end of the artificial Cuban insurrection by making an example, and so the local Spanish authorities got permission to execute all 53 people from that ship - the captain, 36 crew members and 16 passengers. The American chauvinist press (the term jingo -chauvinist first appeared during the Anglo-Russian crisis of 1877-1878) called wildly for war, but Fish cleverly confided to the Spanish legation in Washing- ton/D. C. that he could prevent a conflict. C. that he could avert a conflict if Spain made a gesture of regret. The Spanish immediately agreed to arbitration and eventually delivered the seized *Virginius* and paid \$80,000 in cash damages^ Had Fish wanted to, he could have had the war for nothing in 1873 or 1874, which came in 1898.

Seward had tried to negotiate a Panama Canal treaty with Colombia before leaving office with President Johnson in 1869, but the sum offered to the Bogota government for the canal rights was so shabby that the Colombian Senate rejected the treaty. When all this was precisely repeated 34 years later, in 1903, President Teddy Roosevelt brutally seized the entire region without even informing the Colombian government or the US Congress. When Colombia sent a force by sea to reclaim its own territory, it was intercepted and overwhelmed by the US Navy - without a declaration of war. No wonder that for all "Latinos" the Panama Canal has become the eternal symbol of generations of unchecked US military aggression against all of Latin America⁸⁸

When Fish studied the canal issue on behalf of Grant, he was told by

technicians that a Nicaragua canal should be built - it would be cheaper and easier than through mountainous Panama, and besides, Nicaragua was a *de facto* protectorate of the USA^{8^}

Although a Nicaragua Canal has been much discussed to this day, every US administration from Grant onwards has persistently rejected this attractive and feasible alternative. Teddy Roosevelt's unprovoked, criminal military aggression against Colombia in 1903 was the first culmination of this blind obstinacy. Had Teddy Roosevelt been subjected to the same theoretical kind of international law as Hermann Göring at Nuremberg in 1946, Teddy would have been quickly arrested, tried and hanged; and unlike Goering, who by Lord Halifax's own word did everything in his power to prevent the outbreak of war in 1939, Teddy's execution would have been richly deserved for the undeclared US war against Colombia, which he alone initiated - if it is true that war in place of negotiation as the principal instrument of national policy is a capital offense worthy of death.

The USA conquers the Kingdom of Hawaii

When James Cook (1728-1779), a Scottish captain in English service, discovered Hawaii during the American Revolutionary War, this Polynesian archipelago was divided into small tribal territories that seemed to be constantly at odds with each other. But the natives had natural political sense, so they quickly organized a centralized kingship that encompassed all the islands to forestall possible invasion and annexation by foreign powers. By the time of the American Civil War, mainly the British and Russians were interested in Hawaii for business, whereupon both Japanese and Americans entered the scene - the former as peaceful immigrants (the Japanese are the largest ethnic group in Hawaii today), the latter as imperialist would-be conquerors. The first proposal for U.S. occupation of Hawaii without a declaration of war was made as early as 1870 by the American diplomatic representative in Honolulu, Henry Peirce[^]. The same Grant administration diplomat paved the way for Yankee capital's dominant role in the Hawaiian sugar industry, in the Hawaiian sugar industry during the 1870s, and he was also the first official spokesman to advocate the establishment of a massive American naval base at Pearl Harbor - thest base that Frank Roosevelt later used as bait for the Japanese retaliatory attack in 1941⁹¹.

^{Kō}After 1870, King Kalakaua realized that the only real threat^{für} di^e to the independence of his highly civilized country came from American^{sche} imperialism. For the purpose of appeasement, he reluctantly decided to visit the USA in 1874-1875 and was, as Campbell notes, "the first reigning king ever to visit our country."⁹² The king's bifurcated policy of appeasement towards the

USA was ultimately unsuccessful, although he granted the Americans most-favored-nation economic rights and obtained their supposedly sacred and legally binding promise never to occupy Hawaii. Grant and subsequent presidents up to Grand Cleveland (who left office for the second time in 1897) vowed to respect Hawaiian sovereignty forever in exchange for lavish economic concessions to the Americans, but King Kalakaua and other Hawaiians sadly failed to realize that U.S. promises in foreign treaties were never taken seriously, and that American presidents' word of honor was never worth the paper it was written on. The Indians, for example, who had received false solemn treaty promises from George Washington and all subsequent presidents, could have told them so.

Hawaii was doomed from the time of the first Peirce reports. No other country wanted to fight for Hawaii. Although the Hawaiians wanted to fight for their freedom against America, the heavy defeats they suffered at the hands of US forces in the 1890s proved the hopelessness of their struggle. Their diplomatic skills, which consisted in particular of a fine understanding of quid pro quo agreements, remained ineffective in the face of the total lack of decency and honesty on the part of the USA. Today's fun-loving pleasure travelers stare up at the mighty Diamond Head from the popular Waikiki beach, but few know that on this "Diamond Head" Hawaiian freedom fighters fought their last battle against the cruel and unprovoked U.S. military aggression that destroyed their country forever

Albertine Loomis was thinking of the plight of the surviving Hawaiian natives (who today make up only 15 percent of the population) when she wrote that "history is not a clock that can be set back" and that the Hawaiian people should therefore endeavor "to help shape a tolerable present and an acceptable future. Like the Dorian colonists on the island of Melos who were massacred by the Athenians for their neutrality in the Peloponnesian War, the few Hawaiian survivors of insatiably rapacious US imperialism at least have the consolation of knowing that the enlightened leaders of the last years of their independence made every conceivable effort and avoided mistakes to avert a doom that then became inevitable because of the viciousness of their adversaries. One could appropriately compare their efforts with those of Hitler to avoid war with America after Frank Roosevelt's personal declaration of war in Chicago on October 5, 1937. Eager to keep the peace between Germany and the US, Hitler made every effort and no mistake - but the spitefulness of his adversary eventually led to the conflict Germany never wanted⁹⁵.

The Hawaiian Islands were not the only Polynesian targets of US imperialism in the Pacific Ocean. Hawaii was 2100 miles from San Francisco, which was founded by Spain in 1776, later inherited by Mexico, but taken from the Mexicans by the US in 1846 and formally annexed in 1848. Between Hawaii and Australia lay Samoa, 2260 miles beyond Honolulu and 2355 miles off Sydney/Australia⁹⁶. Pearl Harbor, Pago Pago on Samoa and Manila Bay in the Philippines were the best ports in the entire extensive Pacific island world - apart from the four main Japanese islands⁹⁷. And these three best ports were all in American hands within two generations of San Francisco being taken from Mexico. In this context, it is important to remember that direct trade between the US and China began in 1784, one year after the end of the American Revolutionary War, and that US economic, political and military aggression began with the first Anglo-Chinese Opium War of 1839-1842 - a war with the aim of China's illegal drug importation, and a war that was hotly advocated by the same^Y ankee agitators in New England who believed it was^{eine} the moral duty of the US to destroy the US South. ^KIn short, Yankee imperialism had been at work in Asia and the silent^{Ozean} long before San Francisco, the ideal gateway to Pacific^{sche} n colonies, was taken from Mexico⁹⁸.

Pago Pago was then invaded in 1872 by the American naval^{feh} Ishaber Meade, who proclaimed that the natives^{rene} n the entire surrounding region were subjects of the USA - without bothering with such minor details as existing international treaties or obtaining authorization from their own government for such drastic steps under international law⁹⁹. But as soon as Fish and Grant found out about Meade's coup, they put together a fake treaty and had it confirmed by the US Senate. Charles Sumner, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, had traveled to Europe and lived there for several years. Unlike Fish and Grant, he had some idea of the European reality. Apart from a certain enthusiasm for England, which Fish had inherited from his relatives, neither Fish nor President Grant knew anything about Europe. Sumner, on the other hand, knew that Samoa had been an area of lively German economic interest since the 1840s, as extensive, peaceful trade developed between the Free Hanseatic City of Harnburg - Germany's largest trading port - and the entire Samoan archipelago. Theodor Weber, German Consul General in Samoa in 1872, therefore regarded Meade's coup as a joke of the worst kind.

The Samoa agitation against Germany

Bismarck, who had said that the Little Germany of 1871 had one advantage over the former thousand-year-old Greater Germany, namely that there were now two great German capitals, Berlin and Vienna, corresponding to the two

great English-speaking capitals, London and Washington - this Bismarck eagerly cultivated the best possible diplomatic relations with both England and the USA, as part of his long-term political strategy as well as his short-term diplomatic tactics, which sought to isolate the still retaliatory, defeated France. At the same time, he tried to appease and please the French in the interests of eventual Franco-German reconciliation - a policy that soon paid off for France: with the acquisition of Tunisia in 1881 and Indochina in 1885, both with German diplomatic support. These two French colonial acquisitions were worth more than all the colonies acquired for Germany by Bismarck and his successors (who were all extremely cautious statesmen when it came to scaling back their own country's colonial claims in the interests of global peace and understanding). Bismarck himself had a weakness for Samoan pineapples - his favorite fruit - but had no thoughts of letting Samoa jeopardize his friendship program with the USA. Otherwise, Sumner's view that the USA had no right to acquire a base in the middle of Samoa, which had been an area of predominantly German interest for decades, would have prevailed \^w

Eventually, the US undeservedly acquired and retained Samoa, and in 1878, during Hayes' presidency, the US Senate approved an international treaty confirming Meade's victorious action.¹⁰² But to counter the notion that the US showed any tact or consideration to Germany in this undeserved deal, it is important to note that just the opposite happened - confirming Nietzsche's proposition that small favors are repaid with gratitude, large ones with ingratitude: The US was making non-stop trouble for Germany from the very moment its foothold in Samoa had been legally secured. The American tabloid press was constantly peppered with stories about invented German encroachments in Samoa, until finally in 1898 the archipelago was divided between Germany, the USA and England - and this despite the fact that Robert Louis Stevenson, a successful English author who was also very popular in the USA and had lived in Samoa for many years before 1898, publicly declared many times before the whole world that the German administration in Samoa was excellent[^].

Campbell rightly insists that the artificial unrest over Samoa during the twenty years 1878-1898 "fanned America's simmering antipathy to Bismarckian Germany"^w 4 The US had been overwhelmingly pro-German during the Franco-German War of 1870-1871, just as Bismarck and Prussia had consistently sided with the Union during the Civil War of 1861-1865; but in the case of Samoa, the US behaved like the greedy camel that, generously let into its tent by the Arab, finally claims that the tent is too small for two and the Arab should leave. On the occasion of an insignificant incident in Samoa, in which no American interests were directly affected, Cleveland's Secretary of State Bayard had the audacity to openly agitate for an American war against Germany

^{ren}, which would expel all Germans from the archipelago.

But to prove that Bayard's anti-German zeal did not go beyond President Cleveland, one need only read Cleveland's wildly anti-German message to Congress on January 15, 1889. Cleveland had the gall to claim that there was "a preponderance of German power in Samoa which we never anticipated." ¹⁰⁶ The reaction was an outburst of wild public hatred of Germany, instigated by the government. The St. Louis newspaper "Republic" spoke of a fictitious "unanimity of American opinion" that the Germans should be expelled from Samoa and - equally absurd - that there was a unanimous "dislike of Bismarck" ¹⁰⁷ in the USA. Senator John Reagan of Texas, a notorious bully, called Germany "brutal." ¹⁰⁸ Cleveland demanded and received special Congressional appropriations for an increase in American forces in Samoa, and this increase became law in February 1889. This abrupt jingoism was all the more remarkable given that Cleveland had just lost his second presidential bid and was to leave office just two months after signing this incendiary military bill ¹⁰⁹.

Bismarck and the Americans

Bismarck remained calm in the face of this blatant American ingratitude or - one can call it this without risk of exaggeration - this psychotic official behavior of the USA. He immediately invited England and the USA to a conciliation conference in Berlin. The British were disgusted by the crazy warmongering attitude of the USA - the attempt to start major wars without any plausible reason - and immediately accepted Bismarck's offer. The USA, on the other hand, reacted as always in the manner of the great spokesman, who is first and foremost a coward. In the face of Bismarck's Anglo-German front, America's enthusiasm for the war quickly wilted and the storm in a teacup subsided. Meanwhile, in March 1889, a hurricane struck Apia on Samoa. Three German and three American ships sank, while the only British ship in the area miraculously escaped. Over one hundred American and German sailors ^{eri} perished. The American ^{ami} loudmouths took advantage of this *deus ex machina* to save face: The Jewish New York "World" called a ^m ⁶.

On April 4, 1889, the newspaper called the hurricane a tragic sign that God was in favor of American-German reconciliation. Even more sentimental and maudlin, the "World" described the German and American dead as the "bond that now unites us with Germany".

The same New York "World" took the lead a few years later before the entire

American tabloid press by feeding the hysterical, artificial panic that some utterly fabulous Spanish military venture to attack New York City was imminent, paving the way for President McKinley's cynical decision, prompted by Republican boss Mark Hanna, to have the U.S. Congress declare war against Spain, even though a few days earlier the Spanish had met all diplomatic demands. The fundamental outrageousness of US foreign policy was a constant factor, but the hysteria with which this foreign policy was conducted increased in ferocity, enabling the outstanding international crimes then committed by Woody Wilson and Frank Roosevelt in the 20th century.

President Harrison's Secretary of State was James Blaine, who had been publicly exposed as a fraud before his appointment. He was proven to be an accomplice of the criminal Jewish Parisian Credit Mobilier, a financial organization that rivaled and was overwhelmed by the Rothschilds in the 1890s. Both during and after the American Civil War, the Credit Mobilier bribed crowds of senators and congressmen, while taking most of the money granted by the U.S. government to private railroads. Blaine was Speaker of the House of Representatives when he took Jewish bribes. James Garfield - elected US president in 1880 and then assassinated by a supporter of his rival Grant - was also among those bribed. Blaine had no intention of attending Bismarck's Berlin Conference of 1889 himself. Bismarck was hated by corrupt and narrow-minded people like Blaine, but he was greatly admired by decent American intellectuals like Motley and Bancroft. Blaine^{sc} picked a zero as the head of an incompetent American delegation, whereas the British delegation was led by the diplomatic ace^{iSr} Edward Malet and the German delegation was led by the chancellor's son Count Herbert Bismarck^{^4}

Prince Bismarck himself was the author of the smooth compromise^{ses}, which was then included in the Berlin Treaty of June 14, 1889^{WUr} de. He wanted to take the wind out of the sails of the powerful clique of American warmongers, especially Jews, who wanted war with Germany at any price in order to boost the American economy and to make it easy blood-money profits. The treaty stipulated that the King of Sweden or Norway should appoint an arbitrator for all conflicting claims of the USA, England and Germany. This arrangement actually made it impossible in future for the American warmongers to find any pretext in Samoa for a war of aggression against Germany-a war of the kind advocated by the outgoing crude and vulgar President Cleveland. Blaine and Cleveland were men of the sort America's plutocratic evildoers liked to foist on the US population as leaders, and with whom Bismarck had to contend in his patient search for American-English-German friendship and cooperation^{^m}

It was solely because England stood firmly behind Germany on the Samoa issue that the US Senate felt compelled to ratify the Berlin Treaty in 1890, long after it had been accepted by England, the German Empire and the Samoans.

Secretary of State Blaine rudely and bluntly informed the German diplomatic mission in the US that he did not like the treaty, but it was another generation before the US, under Wilson's leadership, found another pretext to take aggressive action against Germany - with results that were ultimately disastrous for Germany, the US and the world.

The economic basis of American world imperialism

The American threat to world peace increased because the USA became more and more of a giant with the brain of an imbecile. As a result of the influx of European emigrants and the careless plundering of the enormous natural resources of the United States, the gross national product of the country quadrupled in the thirty-two years from 1869 to 1901, agricultural production tripled in the same period, and there was also an increase in the American railroad network from 35085 to 250 143 miles. The density of the railroad network had proven its importance in the American Civil War, as well as in Bismarck's three short wars against Denmark (1864), Austria (1866) and France (1870-1871).

The American index of industrial production rose from 17 in 1865 to 100 in 1900. Although Germany - like America - surpassed England in industrial power during these years, and the Germans could boast more and better industrial innovations than the English or the Americans, it was the sheer size of the USA combined with its crazy foreign policy that made this country the greatest threat to world peace since the days of the late Roman Empire¹¹S.

Unlike Germany or England, where 40 and 50 percent of the gross national product came from foreign trade, the USA was largely an isolated self-sufficient market of low quality but high quantity, with foreign trade accounting for less than 5 percent of the gross national product. Although American exports grew from 281 million dollars in 1865 to 1394 million in 1900, these sums seem almost insignificant compared to the huge volume of foreign trade of England or Germany before 1914¹² Although this small volume of American foreign trade should have reduced US belligerence in conflicts where trade issues were at stake, there was never any sign of moderation on the part of the Americans - and yet economic self-sufficiency gave the US an enormous advantage over England or Germany in terms of the economics of warfare. It also gave the USA an advantage over Tsarist Russia.

For comparison: Russia's economic disadvantage

^{strie}The Russians industrialized rapidly under the leadership of Serge Witte during the reign of Tsar Nicholas II (1894-1917), but it was not possible for the vast Russian Empire - even with the multitude of outstanding German technicians in the Tsar's service - to achieve in^{ner} half a generation the kind of balance between industrial production and raw material production that characterized the American^{sche} economy from 1900 onwards. Thus, in 1913, Russia was far ahead of the United States in the export of land products, and the country was producing what it needed in crude oil, but despite the vast Russian iron and coal deposits, there had simply not been the time or the foreign investment capital to develop the American type of self-sufficient and balanced economy that could later have withstood the near-total blockade of Russia, as occurred after British diplomacy forced the Turkish Empire into the First World War on the side of the Central Powers in 1914i^ For twelve years it had been England's intention to artificially provoke a war and then destroy both Germany and Russia, although these two neighboring powers were on different sides in that war thanks to English diplomacy. Asquith and Grey successfully triggered the war, but they had not yet achieved their ultimate goal when they were forced to resign in 1916 as a result of German victories over England - particularly on the Somme in France. These goals would not have been achieved under the dictatorship of Lloyd George (1916-1922) either, had not the British Foreign Secretary Balfour, by offering the densely populated Arab Palestine for Jewish settlement, persuaded world Jewry, with the help of his servile puppet Woody Wilson, to force the USA into the war on the side of the Allies against the will of its population. The British had promised Arab Palestine to the Arabs in 1915, to the French in 1916 (in the Sykes-Picot Treaty), de facto to the Jews in 1917-but finally, when Al-Lenby took Jerusalem from the Turks in 1917, the British kept all of Palestine under their own rule with the express intention of keeping the land forever as part of their Middle East oil base in Egypt, Iraq and Kuwait. It was then only the proverbial Jewish terrorism, with the full and uncritical support of the USA, that forced the unexpected abandonment of Palestine by the British in 1948. This decisive event foiled the British plot to keep Palestine, Lebanon, Syria, Cyprus, Iraq, Kuwait, Egypt and Sudan forever. As usual, the British had spilled an ocean of blood senselessly for something they could not hold on to.

The temporary elimination of both Germany and Russia was achieved, but forty years after 1914 Nikita Khrushchev remarked in a speech in Birmingham that the Soviet Union could defeat England within forty-eight hours in the event of a new Anglo-Russian war, and none of the English dignitaries who were on the stand with Khrushchev dared to doubt this fact. And although Germany has been permanently divided into seven parts since 1945 (Federal Republic, GDR,

rest of Austria, Sudetenland, Oder-Neisse zone, East Prussia, Eupen-Malmedy) , the Federal Republic alone was already in the process of surpassing England forever as an economic and military power. So in the British conspiracy against Russia and Germany, too, many millions of people were senselessly slaughtered just to satisfy a British greed that was many times too euphoric and unrealistic to lead to lasting results of practical significance. And yet, for all the frustration, transience and detachment from reality of their 20th century foreign policy, the British were still masters of *realpolitik* when compared to the Americans. None of the messianic dreams of Woody Wilson or Frank Roosevelt had the slightest bit of reality attached to them - the utopia of "one world under American leadership" dreamed of by these pathological, weak leaders was nothing but a terrifying nightmare that could not be realized from the outset. Yet today's epigones of Wilson and FDR continue to dwell on this nightmare - for domestic political use and advantage, while the rest of the world watches contentedly the waning of American power and prestige, which is happening so incredibly fast that few knowledgeable observers expect the US to be a significant factor in world politics in the year 2000 - if it still exists beyond then.

It should be noted that the **discrepancy** between American economic self-sufficiency before 1914 and the lack of it in Russia was by no means a particular American virtue, but was largely due to the fact that far more European money had been invested in American industry than in Russian industry. Despite the special effort made by France to help the Russians after the formation of the Franco-Russian alliance of 1894, French investment in Russia in 1914 was much smaller than German investment in the USA, not to mention the huge British investment in America, while there was virtually no British investment in Russia.

The USA, a country
without natural enemies and strong neighbors

The USA had another natural advantage over the other great powers after 1900 (these were, besides the USA, Great Britain, the German Empire, France, Russia, Japan, Austria-Hungary and Italy), namely the fact that it had no strong neighbors within thousands of miles, while all the other powers were crowded together. This greatly increased their vulnerability, while the USA was completely safe - especially in the event of a global conflict such as the First and Second World Wars. In this way, even the incompetent and costly policies of the US in these conflicts had to be instantly successful, without this being due to any particular American capability. Things were quite different with the USSR's rapid growth in nuclear power after 1949. Because the USA is so much smaller than the Soviet Union and its decisive assets are ten times more spatially concentrated and therefore easier to destroy than those of the Soviets, it would

be sheer recklessness to bet on a US victory in a conflict. But the USSR has remained peaceful since 1945, while the USA has fought many wars, its armed forces are weakened by subversion and 50 percent of them are made up of dissatisfied blacks. The Soviet Union's prestige and prospects are so great today that it need not fear war with the USA, while all Americans tremble at the prospect of a serious confrontation with Moscow.

In short, the fact that the USA was never exposed to an external threat between the Congress of Vienna in 1815 and the emergence of the Soviet Union as a nuclear power is not to be credited to American foreign policy skill, for such a threat certainly never existed. It was solely a consequence of basic geographical facts, as described compellingly by Thomas Paine in his *Common Sense* of 1776, and by President Washington in his Farewell Address of 1797.

America's unprovoked aggression

Spain was not a threat in 1898 and was attacked unnecessarily. Germany was not a threat in 1917 when it was attacked by Woody Wilson. Frank Roosevelt lied in 1939, 1940 and 1941 when he called Germany a threat. Germany had not even come close to defeating England in 1940 and was in deep trouble with Churchill as well as Stalin when FDR goaded Japan to war in 1941. Japan posed no threat to the US at the time of the Second World War. Under Konoye and Tojo (1939 to 1941), the Japanese leadership had absolutely no desire to wage war against the USA: Chiang Kai-shek's capture by the Communists (1936) had forced the Kuomintang to start a new Chinese war against Japan in 1937, and the main Japanese forces were still tied up there when World War II ended eight years later in 1945.

Only the corrupt OS propaganda was able to claim that the Pearl Harbor strike proved that Japan had been threatening the US for years. England never believed any of this American propaganda garbage. Based on Campbell's accurate statistics, the US in 1900 was: 1) the strongest military power on earth in terms of strategic reserves, 2) the only world power that was self-sufficient in the face of a total blockade, 3) the only world power without strong neighbors within thousands of miles, 4) the only world power that experienced no threat to its national security until 1949. Thus, US court historians are automatically deprived of any reasonable basis for their claim that there are extenuating circumstances for sole American responsibility for the shameful series of armed aggressions by the US between 1898 and 1945.

It has been noted that a third American-English war^{so} had probably been expected in the USA as well as in England for fifty years after the Congress of Vienna, until the spectre was laid to rest by the concessions made to the English by President Benjamin Harrison. Only once again, in 1895, did the old

insecurity come to life when a brama-based President Cleve^{lan} d threatened England with war - under the pretext that the English d^{wÜre}n would not let the USA dictate the terms for the settlement of a^{nes}a lten territorial dispute between England and Venezuela.

If it had come to war in 1895, the USA could undoubtedly have taken Canada away, and the American media were full of threats to that effect. But that would have cost a lot. Although Britain would not have been able to invade the US - as it had done repeatedly in 1812, 1813, 1814 and 1815 - the British navy could easily have laid waste to every US port between Portland, Maine and Seattle, Washington - as it did to the Italian ports during the Second World War. The crisis was settled solely by the unexpected failure of British military aggression against the South African Boers in late 1895. In 1900, when American-English cooperation against Russia in China worked, the situation on the American frontiers against Canada and Mexico was calm. The old order of 1877, which for years had allowed US troops to cross the Mexican border at will, had finally been revoked as Mexico had acquiesced year after year to all US economic imperialist demands" '9

The Central American Union

The USA claimed a de facto protectorate over Guatemala, Mexico's southern neighbor. When a crisis arose in 1881 over rival claims to the Chiapas region, the US intervened and dictated the terms of settlement to Mexico. The US also supported Justo Barrios, its Guatemalan puppet dictator, in a plan to re-establish the Central American Union from the early 19th century. The success of this plan, led by Guatemala, would have allowed the US to tighten its stranglehold on the whole of Central America and increase pressure from the south on encircled Mexico^.

The whole Middle American conspiracy was busted in 1882 by OS- President Chester Artbur, a longtime cronyⁿ of ex-President Grant. Blaine had blocked Grant's intention to i^{sch} seek a third nomination at the 1880 Republican Party convention i^{ne}. Instead, Blaine arranged for the nomination und election of James Garfield, who was a personal friend of his and in league with i^m the machinations of the Jewish credit mobilier. Chester Artbur was chosen by Blaine as Garfield's running mate for the vice presidency in order to confuse Grant supporters - but in the process Blaine sort of outsmarted himself: Garfield was assassinated by a Grant supporter, and that made Grant's friend Artbur the next president. The majority of educated citizens were disgusted by this development, as Artbur had been guilty of massive violence and corruption

during his time as a customs collector in the port of New York. Artbur also saw no reason to fulfill Garfield's promise that Blaine could remain U.S. Secretary of State indefinitely. Artbur had no intention of loosening the American grip on weak little Guatemala, but he also saw no reason why he should not do everything the other way around than Blaine in foreign policy. So Mexico was delighted and Guatemala dismayed when Artbur revoked Blaine in 1882, gave Chiapas to Mexico and expelled the Guatemalans from the territory. Artbur disliked the Mexicans, but he took satisfaction in knowing that his move infuriated Blaine. For the same reason, Artbur also thwarted the Barrios plan to reunify Central America. He publicly declared that the US could better control the whole region through a policy of divide and *rule*¹² 1.

The "Saltpetre War" of 1879; the USA threatens Chile

At the time, both England and the USA had been up to their ears in the Pacific War since 1879, in which Chile was fighting Peru and Bolivia. England initially supported Peru because it wanted a monopoly over the Peruvian saltpetre deposits of Tarapaca, but Chile - an energetic white nation in contrast to its indolent and predominantly Indian enemies - quickly conquered the Bolivian corridor to the sea and invaded Peru victoriously, conquering not only the Tarapaca region but also the mineral-rich provinces of Tacna and Arica. In 1880, the Chileans ignored a stop order from the USA and conquered Lima, the capital of Peru, in^{darau} f the year. The USA had a particular hatred of Chile because Chilean miners had been more successful in the Californian gold^{und} silver fields of the 1850s than a^{he} imi^s tion of American miners. "Many Chileans, along with their wives and children, had been massacred by Yankees in^{ganz} California.

In 1881, Blaine lied to the US Congress that England had transferred its support from Peru to Chile. He hoped to create a mood in favor of direct US military intervention against the Chilean motherland - over three thousand miles away from the USA. In a hoarse voice he shouted in Congress: "It is an English war against Peru, with Chile as its instrument, and I take responsibility for this statement"^. Blaine's desire to intimidate South America was widely echoed in Congress. Many hoped that the United States would fight in South America and did not care if a scoundrel like Blaine created the opportunity.

Stephen Hurlbut, the American envoy to Peru, acted as if Chile and the USA were at war with each other. He bombarded the Chileans with ultimatums and warned them that the USA would exterminate their entire population if they

annexed even a single foot of Peruvian soil^m. The Peruvian dictator Calderon was captured by the Chileans on November 5, 1881, who soon brought him to Santiago/Chile for safekeeping. It was on this day that Blaine realized that Artbur would remove him as foreign minister. Blaine, however, had no thoughts of letting his enemy Artbur become a glamorous war president. So he deceived all his cronies in the US Congress by issuing a bombastic invitation to all Latin American states to attend a conference in Washington/D. C. on anti-European Western Hemisphere solidarity and to settle the Pacific War by diplomatic means shortly before US military intervention 124.

Although Blaine had thus deprived Artbur of the opportunity to wage an effortless war - like the one McKinley would wage against Spain sixteen years later - he also underestimated Artbur and his new foreign minister Fred Frelinghuysen. Frelinghuysen, who had been a U.S. senator from New Jersey for years, stunned Blaine when he published the latter's entire diplomatic correspondence on January 26, 1882¹²⁵. It became clear to everyone in a flash that Blaine had been a false peacemaker, and in fact a warmonger. In August, Artbur withdrew all the invitations to the Pan-American Conference that had been accepted in the meantime - to the relief of the "Latinos", who knew full well that the only purpose of this conference would have been even more Yankee tutelage for Latin America. They had accepted the invitation mainly out of fear¹²⁶.

After the furious American pressure eases^e Chile agreed to a moderate peace with Peru in 1882, retaining only the narrow Bolivian corridor (which resembled the unnatural Polish corridor of 1919-1939) and the aforementioned three disputed provinces along the new border between Peru and Chile¹²⁷. Ironically, Blaine's threatening accusation in 1881 that England was the power behind what was happening in Chile was expertly seized upon by British diplomats: they created a permanent British dominance in Chile where there had been none before, which then made it easy to secure the prime mining concessions in the new, previously Peruvian provinces of Chile for England. While the United States complained long and loud about these economic facts, it would be unfair to say that Blaine's overweening diplomacy, her exposure by Frelinghuysen and rejection by Artbur damaged American prestige in South America: The rapacious Yanqui from the north were, after all, heartily hated and despised throughout South America long before 1879 and the Pacific War.

Trade war over tainted pork

OS propagandists made much of Bismarck's alleged distaste for tainted

American export pork during World War I, but in reality France distinguished itself far more than Germany in the international pork controversy at the expense of the United States - and this during the years of a virtual permanent crisis in the American economy from 1873 to 1898 (roughly twice the duration of the so-called Great American Depression of 1929-1941¹²⁹).

Pork accounted for twelve percent of total U.S. exports in 1879, and most of it went to England, Germany, and France¹³⁰. Before the end of 1880, however, American^{sc} pork was banned from France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, Greece, Romania, Portugal, and Spain.

Although the import of pork was not generally banned in England, the London Times printed a letter from the British consul in Philadelphia in early 1881 describing the horrors of trichinosis caused by the^{er} diseased pigs (^{die} American pigs were then, as now, one hundred per cent infested^v with these parasitic worms) and also stating that this type of pork was suitable for the American colonists, but not for civilized Europeans¹³¹. The British Foreign Office also published this letter in an official blue book. At this time, the British were in favor of free trade and did not like to ban foreign products - because of the inevitable retaliation in the form of high tariff barriers against British exports - but they appealed to the civic pride of English import-export merchants not to accept the contaminated and inferior American meat products. France then led the way after 1881 with a total ban on American pork, and the French press reminded its readers that "the Americans had hoped for a German victory in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1871"[^].

Bismarck agreed to a ban on American pork imports in 1883, but the ban was lifted eight years later on the initiative of Kaiser Wilhelm II. because it turned out that an extensive testing procedure for American cooked pork products sufficiently protected the health of German consumers. Since the German official stance on the pork issue was more moderate than that of France and many other countries, it was unfair of the US media to make Bismarck the scapegoat. American merchants had tried to push thousands of tons of diseased meat into the European market for the sake of crass profit - with the same indifference they had grown accustomed to towards their American consumers. Thousands of Americans suffered terrible pain as a result of *Trichinella* infections, and many of them died^{t33}.

Attitude of the American towards foreigners

It can be said of the Far East that as the profits of American traders there increased, Americans began to dismiss all *Oriental*s as inferior and decadent¹³⁴. The prejudice and ignorance of the Americans towards these people coincided

with their attitude towards the Indians in their own country, the African Negroes and all Latin Americans, whether they were white, mestizo or Indian. There was a deeply ingrained element in the American character that made the oppressed inhabitants of the United States despise all foreigners to some degree, but certain groups, such as those just mentioned, outright. This element derived from the bourgeois fact that the seven generations of early European immigration (1607-1776) - and especially those from England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales - had consisted of 90 percent underdogs, those who had fallen hopelessly short in Europe. Their arrogance towards foreigners was an unconscious admission of their own inferiority. This attitude did not change noticeably during the eight generations after independence because it had become so ingrained during the earlier period. A keen-eyed observer like John Adams correctly defined the average materialistic American. By the time Adams made this judgment in the 1780s, it was long too late for Americans to change. After their destruction of Corinth, Greece in 146 B.C., the Romans had close contact with the superior Greek culture, but the Roman character had been formed and solidified much earlier. There is no example that pointing out flaws in the national character of a people - as John Adams did for the Americans - would have caused that people to change their attitude. The transformation of the USA by world Jewry in the last century is something quite different, because this result was brought about not by ideas but by money. Money, however, is the only thing in the world to which Americans give their undivided attention.

The Chinese in California

The leading plutocrat gang in early California-the Huntington, Stanford, Crocker and Hopkins-who had switched from land/goods trading to land/railroads in the 1850s, did not hesitate to import Chinese laborers for their railroad construction projects because Chinese were cheaper than the starving Irish employed in the East by the competing Union Pacific railroad. In addition, Chinese could be sold to^{de} in eastern USA as strikebreakers - Calvin Sampson gaveⁱⁿ the Massachusetts shoe industry a notable example of this use of Chinese. A dozen years after the Gwa^{dalu} pe-Hidalgo Treaty, which ended the U.S.-Mexican^{schen} War in 1848 and brought California to the United States, there were 35,000 Chinese in^{Staa} t California, and by 1880 they were 75,132- a full 9 percent of the total population of 800,000. By comparison, at the time of the conquest of California, there were only 8,000 Mexicans there, and two generations later, in 1900, there were still no more than 8,000¹³⁵ ^ Elsewhere in the USA - mainly in the regions neighboring California - there were 30,000 more Chinese. Hatred of the Chinese was rekindled year after year after the onset of the Depression of

1873. Ironically, the main argument against the Chinese was this: "They show little interest in their new country, only for its money"¹³⁶. In this respect, the Chinese fit into the American environment they had entered-recruited by Yankee traders in China ^1

The Irish, immigrants to California from a people threatened with extermination by the English for 700 years, were the natural leaders in the popular violence against the Chinese of California, and in San Francisco - then home to a quarter of the state's total population - Dennis Kearney held mass meetings out in the sand dunes at Ocean Beach. Kearney's party became known as the Sand/otters; it had the simple program that the American soul has always cherished: Just kill enough of them and the federal government will take notice, no matter what the plutocratic exploiters of the Chinese say or do¹³⁹. This strategy worked as usual A few years later, Kearney could boast that his sand/otters had forced the creatures of the plutocrats-President Artbur and the US Congress-to pass the Chinese Exclusion Act of May 6, 1882, which remained in effect without significant changes until after World War II. In the USA, political murder was and is the most effective weapon. Not even 1,000 Chinese were killed, but lasting results were quickly achieved¹⁴⁰.

Campbell recalls that in the 1880s the most hated immigrants were the 'Yids, Polacks, Hunkies, Dagoes and Greasers, that is, Jews, Poles, Czechs, Italians and Mexicans", and that the USA repeatedly got into diplomatic trouble for massacres of these minority groups¹⁴¹.

Social Darwinism, the philosophy of the plutocrats

American popular sentiment, which had always been brutal, was further brutalized by the smug philosophy of the repulsive English social Darwinist Herbert Spencer (1820-1903), who also strongly influenced British imperialists. Although Spencer was one of those authors whose impact did not last beyond their deaths, he had a considerable influence on the American generation after the Civil War¹⁴². His unfinished theories were derived from the unproven and later partially disproved theories published by Charles Darwin (1809-1882) in his 1859 book *Origin of Species*. Andrew Carnegie (1835-1919), a leading plutocratic evildoer in the USA, exclaimed joyfully after reading Spencer's "Social Statics" ¹⁴³ that he suddenly saw the light and that everything was now clear! Carnegie was thrilled to discover in Spencer a rational justification for his - Carnegie's - own crooked business practices, including the bribery of corrupt politicians to the detriment of the oppressed American masses. Campbell aptly summarizes Spencer's message to the US thus: An emerging world power must "compete fanatically with other nations...for its place in the sun.... must swallow weaker countries" in order not to fall into decay⁴⁴.

Apart from the countless errors in Darwin's¹⁴⁵ and Spencer's¹⁴⁶ thinking, it was impertinent and grotesque for the USA of 1880 to worry about its place in the sun, since it had already occupied an enormous piece of earth far beyond what it deserved - and besides, the word civilization did not appear at all in Spencer's call to compete "fanatically" with other peoples. Herbert Spencer often visited the USA, where he collected larger fees than in England and also found the kind of brutalized and gullible audience best suited to his aims¹⁴⁷. In fact, Spencer's influence on the average American was the same as Karl Marx's influence on the average European - Spencer advocated the abolition of conscience in the interests of plutocracy and chauvinism,^{ger} adeso as Marx advocated the abandonment of conscience in the interests of collectivism ^{tivs} and class struggle.

The teachings of Herbert Spencer

Spencer claimed to be the mirror of an inescapable biological purpose, just as Marx, in his inversion of Regel, claimed that not idealism but materialism and a mechanical and economic purpose was the mainspring of humanity. Both claimed to be objective scientists, but were in fact barbaric throwbacks to the primitive era of teeth and claws, when life was, as Thomas Hobbes said, "dangerous, brutish and short". By abolishing personal conscience in favor of a corrupt collectivism, Spencer and Marx declared themselves against the West and against its idealistic roots and traditions as reflected by the long line of thinkers from Plato to Augustine to Rule4s.

Spencer did not misuse Darwin as the basis for the absurd, messianic theory of global Anglo-Saxon superiority, because Darwin himself had developed this theory, and in the USA Spencer received support from the respected Harvard historian and Darwinist John Fiske¹⁴⁹. Fiske repeated his lecture on "Manifest Destiny" hundreds of times throughout the USA with the brutal tenor that it was the destiny of the "English race" to conquer and subjugate the whole world¹⁵⁰. No wonder a charlatan like Herbert Spencer was able to thrive in this swamp of immaturity and primitiveness.

Captain Mahan, the prophet of naval warfare

One of the worst and most influential American Social Darwinists was Captain Alfred Mahan, a career US Navy officer who alone provided the entire worldview of Teddy Roosevelt and his younger cousin Frank Roosevelt. Mahan's arrogant writings were completely lacking in modesty and conscience. In fact, Mahan possessed one of the most fearsome propaganda brains of all time. It would be an understatement to say that Mahan loved war, for Mahan

was the educated version, so to speak, of General Sherman, the barbaric Civil War commander who devastated Georgia and South Carolina. Mahan was obsessed with a burning desire to use American military might, not only to increase U.S. prestige through senseless battlefield victories, but also to inflict maximum terror on the rest of humanity. Mahan raved about the relentless history of British aggression at sea, including countless surprise attacks on neutral nations in Europe, Asia and Africa since the days of Elizabeth I.

Mahan's most eloquent disciple and first biographer William Puleston¹⁵¹ described Mahan as a selfless American patriot, but there is a difference between responsible love of country and chauvinism. Mahan's chauvinism, whether it was selfless or not, could only hurt the United States in the long run - not to mention the innocent victims of unbridled American military aggression. Mahan had found plenty of time to read during his early shipboard service in the U.S. Navy, and the work that influenced him most and provided the thrust for his own later writing was Theodor Mommsen's *Roman History* ¹⁵². Mahan was attracted to Mommsen's "Great Men" theory of history, but his great discovery in Mommsen was the fact that seafaring had played the decisive factor in the bloody series of wars between Carthage and Rome (268-241, 219-202, 149-146 BC). Mahan immediately applied Mommsen's treatment of Rome to his own treatment of England, being an extreme Anglo-Saxon racist and a disciple of the American Hamiltonian tradition of Anglomania³.

Mahan was twice president of the American Naval War College in Newport, Rhode Island (1886-1889 and 1892-1893), and between these two terms of office his two major works were published¹⁵⁴. These books were probably impeccable in terms of military historical facts, but they contained nothing new or anything that could not be found better expressed in the work of the English historian Thomas Macaulay (1800-1859) or the French historian Guillaume Guizot (1787-1876) and the Scotsman Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881). Mahan's historical research made use of ¹⁵⁵ published secondary sources and offered no new insights^{miss} e based on genuine research into unpublished primary sources.

The gospel of naval imperialism

While Mahan was critical of the Stuart Restoration in England before the so-called Glorious Revolution of 1688, his treatment of English war and foreign policy over the subsequent five generations was nothing more than an uncritical adoption of the kind of fairy-tale English achievements presented to budding Oxford undergraduates. His main theme was the alleged necessity of an Anglo-American alliance and worldwide Anglo-American naval supremacy - both ostensibly in the interests of civilization and human progress. The extraordinary impact of Mahan's work in the USA was due to the timing of its publication. In the previous decade, the US had built an expensive fleet of modern warships

with the White Squadron, simply because the bureaucrats did not know what to do with the budget surpluses resulting from the American protective tariff system. The money could not be used for public works and infrastructure improvements because the Supreme Court had just ruled that the government could not engage in economic activity that should be reserved exclusively for plutocratic miscreants. There was quite a bit of embarrassment over the creation of a new modern navy at a time when there was not a cloud in the sky, at least in U.S. relations with the major naval powers. But then Mahan was timely with his American manifesto *Destiny at Sea*, which first inspired Teddy Roosevelt and later Frank Roosevelt. Mahan's books did not have much of an impact in England, where people understood a lot about the issues at stake. Puleston did, however, make much ado about the fact that Mahan's work caught the attention of Kaiser Wilhelm II, a voracious reader of everything - but Wilhelm's ideas about the need for a sizable German fleet were already fully formed by the time he ascended the throne in 1888. The actual Mahan wave remained confined to the USA and was based solely on the fact that Mahan subsequently justified the excessive naval construction of the 1880s^^

In the 1890s, when the Panama Canal did not yet exist (the US did not take possession of the territory until 1903, and the canal was not opened until 1914), Mahan subscribed to the theory of a two-ocean fleet, which called for the US to have two huge navies - one in the Atlantic, one in the Pacific - because of the long approach routes around Cape Horn at the southern tip of South America. From Mahan's point of view, this justification was basically meaningless, as he excluded England from the list of possible enemies of the USA. The British, for their part, had for many years based their naval policy on the axiom of the two-fleet standard, which demanded that the British navy should be stronger than the world's second and third largest fleets put together. Mahan's books were published in 1890 and 1892, and Germany did not begin to build a significant navy until 1897. The second and third largest fleets in 1892 were the French and Russian fleets, but their combined strength was less than that of the British fleet. There was no basis for the unrestrained naval building Mahan was calling for. If the United States Treasury already had a large surplus - due to the high tariff wall - then it was best to take an example from France and Germany and start a program to conserve the dwindling natural resources instead of wasting huge sums on unnecessary warships that would soon be obsolete and - scrapped - serve as raw material for the still small Japanese fleet without having served any useful purpose.

Naval armaments and "dollar diplomacy"

One would think that the Civil War - by then the most sacrificial war in history - had quenched the American thirst for bloodshed for at least fifty years. In a nutshell, however, Mahan's mission was to create strife throughout the world where there was none. Mahan was a historian fit for his time, but not a great one. His influence was only pernicious, without any positive side effects. That Teddy and Frank Roosevelt regarded him respectfully as a kind of glorious god of war speaks for itself¹⁵⁶.

But Mahan was also the father of the so-called dollar diplomacy of Teddy Roosevelt, Bill Taft and subsequent presidents. As he was happy to use any argument in favor of huge US navies, he also used this one: The American navy could exert pressure to force foreign states to buy inferior American goods that they otherwise did not want¹⁵⁷. Such a policy was in fact neither new nor surprising to the world: England had used it in its two Opium Wars against China, turning hundreds of millions of Chinese into drug addicts. It speaks for itself that Mahan was enthusiastic about these evil English examples. John Hay, whose China policy set new standards of cruelty after his appointment as Foreign Secretary, had by his own admission become a disciple of Mahan when he served in the American embassy in London in the early 1890s¹⁵⁸.

Permanent expansion -
across the globe and out into space

Brooks Adams, Harvard's philosopher of history, after studying the impact of Mahan, predicted that the West would lose its civilization and revert to barbarism¹⁵⁹. F. J. Turner, the influential Wisconsin historian, predicted in his essay "The Meaning of the >Boundary< in American History" that the United States had barely begun its imperialist career in the 1890s. He warned the world that "he would be a premature prophet who claimed that the expansive character of American life had now (that is, after the end of the >frontier<>) entirely disappeared. Movement has been its fundamental trait, and it is only when this training would accomplish nothing in a people that American energy will not constantly demand a still wider field for its exercise"¹⁶¹.

The whole globe itself was too small a field for the huge and superficial American ego. After supposedly making peace in 1945, but in reality turning Europe into a chaos of bullets and murder, the US became embroiled in spooky plans to conquer the entire solar system and the myriad star systems beyond. What good is it for a man to gain an entire city and lose his own soul in the process - this admonition had no meaning for the rapacious American establishment. The official pragmatic philosophy of America, as pioneered by C. S. Peirce and his disciples as a proclamation of natural folk wisdom, meant the abandonment of personal conscience in favor of a triumphant expansion of

pluralistic American collectivism led by its plutocratic oligarchs. America's low materialist pragmatism is at odds with the German tradition of philosophical idealism¹⁶².

The Inter-American Conference of 1889/90

Blaine's crude and underhanded diplomacy had been publicly exposed by the Arthur administration,¹⁶³ but Blaine retained enough influence with the small, wealthy group of malefactors in the ruling Republican Party that in 1889 President Harris—a minor tool of the Indiana plutocrats—felt compelled to reinstate Blaine to the leadership of the State Department. There he again began to pursue his plan for an Inter-American Conference in Washington, D.C., with persistent zeal. The conference actually took place between November 18, 1889 and April 19, 1890, and with the exception of Santo Domingo, all Latin American states attended out of fear. Santo Domingo's refusal was out of desperate defiance after the USA's earlier plans to annex the island as a colony had become public knowledge. The "La Tinos" were shocked when they realized Blaine's long-term goal of controlling their foreign policy in the interests of US imperialism. The Argentine delegate, even though his pants were flapping, spoke for them all in front of the General Assembly: "I have no lack of love and affection for America. Nor do I lack trust and gratitude towards Europe. I do not forget that there is Spain, our mother ... that there is Italy, our friend, and France, our sister"¹⁶⁴.

The Latin American countries found themselves in an OS imperialist vise. Napoleon III and Emperor Maximilian's attempt to prevent an Anglo-American imperialist monopoly of power in the Western Hemisphere had failed. Since then, the "Latinos" prayed that one day Europe would rescue them from their situation, which was no longer compatible with true sovereignty¹⁶⁵.

The Inter-American Conference of 1889-1890 was filled with controversies between Blaine and the Chileans, the aftermath of which resulted in the undeclared US war against Chile of 1891-1892^{stan} d, with which the US responded to an insignificant incident^{ten} (the Chileans had imprisoned two drunken American ^{sailors} in Valparaiso who were molesting Chilean women¹⁶⁶). It is impossible^{lich} i's t refute Campbell's assertion that the so-called^{Pan-} Americanism of the USA in the 1880s and 1890s (as ever^{ner} i'm 20th century) was due exclusively to the USA's desire to^{ric} exploit Latin American countries, and that even today "Latinos " continue to pray that one day they will be able to throw off the yoke of Anglo-American imperialism that has determined their fate for many generations[^]

Now Harrison made his grand offer of a permanent alliance between the USA and England in the interests of a future worldwide Anglo-American

imperialism. It was still widely gnawing at the American people that the American expedition against Quebec had failed in 1775, and that the outnumbered Canadians had outright defeated the Yankees at Detroit in the War of 1812 and destroyed the US base at Astoria, but now Harrison made it clear to all the world that the US had given up its old ambition to liquidate English Canada. There were only two brief periods of renewed tension in the 1890s and 1920s, when it appeared that the USA might occupy Canada as a bargaining chip in the struggle against the superior naval power of England.

The Venezuelan border dispute

There had been border disputes between England and Venezuela since Simon Bolivar liberated the latter from Spanish rule in the early 19th century. The border between the rich British Crown Colony of Guiana and neighbouring Venezuela had never been defined by mutually recognized surveyors. Neither England nor Venezuela (a former Spanish colony that had received development aid from Germans who lent money to Spain in the 16th century) had accepted international arbitration for their dispute. In Venezuela, it was known that England had toyed with the idea of annexing Uruguay in the south and Venezuela in the north in the 1840s, but had opted to exploit and dominate both regions more cheaply without formal annexation. Uruguay remained a de facto British protectorate from then until after the Second World War, but Venezuela never accepted the idea that England should have control over its destiny.

In 1840, Robert Schomburgk had drawn a border on a trial basis on behalf of the British, but Venezuela refused to accept it. Venezuela claimed more than half of British Guiana for itself, and there were also some discussions between Venezuela and the USA about the problem after Fish left office in 1877. Gradually, the idea took root in the American government that the Anglo-Venezuelan dispute could provide a good test case to demonstrate the power of the Monroe Doctrine.

A sizable gold discovery in the region during the 1880s triggered the usual British reaction: Suddenly there was a rampant expansion of British territorial claims. Finally, Venezuela broke off diplomatic relations with England in 1887. When the US State Department attempted mediation, the British response was that London would agree to an arbitration boundary west of the Schomburgk Line, but never east of it - and this amounted to a British demand that Venezuela recognize 20,000 square miles of disputed territory as British property and risk the additional cession of Venezuelan territory that had not been claimed by Britain until the 1880s.

Venezuela countered with the demand that the arbitration award should also include land up to the Essequibo River in the east, as this region beyond the Schomburgk Line had been claimed by Venezuela for more than sixty years. Faced with this hopeless situation, President Harrison - the most Anglophile head of government the US had ever had - resorted to delaying tactics, but Grover Cleveland, who returned to the White House after Harrison's one term in office, tackled the matter head on. In the annual messages to the US Congress of 1893 and 1894, he defined the US position as follows: that both parties in the dispute were expected to submit to arbitration according to the principles proposed by Venezuela^^

Secretary of State Gresham, who was less resolute than Cleveland and less inclined to risk open confrontation with England, - instructed former Secretary of State Bayard, appointed Ambassador to England in 1893, to inform British leaders that the United States was primarily interested in arbitration as such, and that the U.S. position was not necessarily as rigid as Cleveland's public statements seemed to indicate. The US would be "happy to assist in arranging arbitration"^^

The former US envoy in Caracas, William Scruggs, was indignant at Gresham's position, which he rightly considered to be weakly Anglophile. Scruggs responded with a powerful monograph, "British Aggressions in Venezuela, or: The Monroe Doctrine on Trial," 1893 which stated exactly the facts mentioned and "made a deep impression" when it was widely circulated among people of influence in late 1894^4

The USA takes sides against England

Leonidas Livingston, a member of the House of Representatives from Georgia, introduced a Joint Resolution on January 10, 1895, co-authored with Scruggs, providing that arbitration on Venezuelan principles "be earnestly recommended," and this resolution was unanimously adopted by the House and Senate on February 20, 1895. The tension increased when the Venezuelans arrested two British officers and six soldiers in January on what they called a hostile mission deep in Venezuelan territory. Gresham remained at cross-purposes with Cleveland and the US Congress. He advised the Venezuelans to settle their conflict with England on their own as best they could, but when Gresham died suddenly on May 28, 1895, Cleveland appointed his friend Richard Olney as the new U.S. foreign minister. Olney was a Boston lawyer of Irish descent who had previously served Cleveland as Attorney General. This Cleveland appointment set everything in motion for the US, as the two Irishmen, Olney and Scruggs, were in complete agreement in their

condemnation of British aggression^^

Olney drafted new instructions for Ambassador Bayard in London on July 2, 1895, which Cleveland enthusiastically approved the same day-he called them "a twenty-inch canon"^^ Together with Olney's instructions for Bayard, a long American note was sent to the British Prime Minister Lord Salisbury. The historical overview of the Venezuela dispute contained in this note was based entirely on Scruggs' book and cast England in a very unfavorable light¹⁷⁸.

Another section of this note dealt with the Monroe Doctrine, which Olney described as "a doctrine of American public right ...which gives the United States the right, but also requires them to regard and treat any usurpation of political control over an American state by a European power as a wrong against themselves"^^ In a bold addendum, Olney condemned all existing European positions in the Western Hemisphere with the old Jeffersonian argument from Nature Genuine, that "three thousand miles of intervening ocean render any permanent political union between a European and an American state unnatural and inexpedient"^^ This message was addressed to Lord Salisbury, of all people, who was a staid diplomatist with a complete contempt for the USA^{1st}.

Because Cleveland found the note quite all right and suggested no changes, his defenders made much ado of the fact that he had not long been married for the first time and that his first legitimate child was born five days after this conversation with Olney. This reminds one of Chancellor von Bülow's excuse thirteen years later that he had been thinking of his vacation on Norderney when he agreed to the publication of Kaiser Wilhelm II's "Daily Telegraph" interview, which was condemned by the majority of the Reichstag. A few days later, Bülow assured the Reichstag with astonishing audacity that the Emperor's indiscretions would be better respected in future, thus making the Emperor the scapegoat for his own incompetence. (This happened after Bülow had probably made the biggest diplomatic blunder in 1905 with his non-recognition of the Björkö alliance between the Kaiser and the Tsar). Olney now offered Cleveland a copy of the instructions for London without asking for their approval. Cleveland had more than six years of experience as president in foreign affairs, while Olney had no diplomatic experience - and Cleveland should have thought of his responsibility for supervising the work of an as yet inexperienced subordinate. The excuse that a still unborn baby prevented Cleveland from concentrating on July 2, 1895, does not hold water.

Cleveland vs. Salisbury

According to Olney's instructions, Bayard was to determine whether or not¹⁷⁹ the Honorable Salisbury - who was both Prime Minister and Secretary

of State^{ster} - wanted to "submit the Venezuelan border question in its entirety n^{ciem} to impartial arbitration" i82 . In addition,^{sollt} e Bayard Salisbury issued a peculiar five-month ultimatum^{len}: Cleveland had to address his seventh annual^{lots} address to the US Congress in December 1895 and demanded that everything be in order in Venezuela by then. Worst of all, however, was the laughable remark with which Olney's message to Salisbury concluded: "Today the United States is practically sovereign on this continent, and its commandment has the force of law in the areas to which it limits its intervention" 183.

Salisbury read Olney's note with the malicious glee of an old schoolmaster about to punish a misbehaving pupil. He immediately decided that the U.S. should receive no reply until Cleveland had sent his message to Congress. Cleveland was in high spirits for weeks because of Olney's supposedly unique diplomatic achievement. He liked Olney's crazy misuse of the Monroe Doctrine and assured him that "you ... place it, in my opinion, on a better and more defensible basis than any of your or my predecessors." 184 Cleveland insisted that "England is bullying the Venezuelans and wiping away protests of the United States in an intolerable manner." 185

Cleveland's stance was influenced by the effects of the new American economic crisis of 1893. The Democratic Party lost heavily in the 1894 congressional elections, and Cleveland tried to distract fickle minds with foreign disputes - just as FDR did again in 1937 with his Chicago attack on Japan, Italy and Germany. (This speech of October 5, 1937 led much of the world to believe that there would be an unnecessary second world war after all. FDR was quite clear in October 1937 that without a war in the near future, his own career would end in dismal failure. Millions of dead human beings never seemed too high a price for FDR to pay to satisfy his own ego). Cleveland, on the other hand, had no intention of bringing about an international war from the start in 1895, but he wanted to see the USA fight England if it would increase his own popularity, and he was counting on at least a sensational diplomatic success. He was tired of hearing about the chronic economic crisis that America had been in for twenty-two years, and he could already hear the radical populists banging on the door. Politically, Cleveland was a reactionary disciple of David Ricardo, who thought the only duty of a government in an economic crisis was to ride it out and wait for the plutocratic miscreants in the private sector to do something about it. Ben Tillman, populist politician in South Carolina, won elections by promising that he would one day go to Washington/D. C. and shove a pitchfork into old Cleveland's fat ribs. So Cleveland believed he could gain much and lose nothing by a bold foreign coup. Olney had been his crony for years and was familiar with Cleveland's views. American court historians like Allan Nevins and Samuel Bemis have tried to scapegoat Olney in Cleveland's

place, just as Hoover was scapegoated for the Depression of 1929, which he had warned about and FDR had promised would never come - but such propaganda efforts have nothing to do with historical scholarship.

Looking at the House of Representatives, where the Democrats had lost more than 50 percent of their seats, falling from 218 to 105, Cleveland became capable of anything in his search for a *deus ex machina* that could reverse the inexorable trend toward decline. There was one sting that pushed Cleveland toward conflict with England, despite the trend toward an American-English alliance initiated by Harrison in 1889, and that was the humiliation Cleveland suffered in Nicaragua in April 1895. This country was a *de facto* protectorate of the USA, but British marines had invaded under the pretext that they had to protect the Mosquito Indians on the east coast of the country. A few weeks before his death, Gresham had blocked Cleveland's attempt to take action against England in Nicaragua¹⁸⁶.

The US President under British pressure

In response to Cleveland's July 1895 challenge in the Venezuela case, London now deployed its Anglo-Jewish clique in the American media to belittle Cleveland and accuse him of fraud. "The Nation" was the most influential political magazine in the USA in the 1890s. Its editor-in-chief, E. L. Godkin, who came from England, slandered Cleveland excessively as soon as his challenge to England became known. In the issue of December 19, 1895, Godkin accused Cleveland of being "capable of exploiting foreign affairs for domestic victories". (The Chicago Tribune made the same accusation against FDR for his Chicago Bridge speech on October 6, 1937. And The Nation was right in 1895, as was the Tribune in 1937).

The prevailing tension grew further when in 1895 the "largest gold nugget" was discovered in Venezuela "that had ever been found anywhere." ¹⁸⁷ If the English had already condemned the Boers to death because there was gold and diamonds in their African countries Transvaal and Orange Free State, then it was reasonable to suspect that England might have intended the same fate for Venezuela and carried out the earlier plan of British annexation of the entire country¹⁸⁸.

Cleveland charged that the Caribbean Sea would "soon become a British inland sea like the Mediterranean." ¹⁸⁹ The base that the British had established on Antigua in 1883 was already being called "the Malta of the West." ¹⁹⁰ Olney's personal friend, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, complained in the US Senate that the West Indies were "littered" with British "bulwarks" ¹⁹¹. The Orinoco was the second largest river in South America -

after the Amazon, the largest river on earth - and was larger than the "silver river" Rio de la Plata. The mouth of the Orinoco was generally recognized as part of Venezuela, but in 1895 England claimed Point Barima at this mouth. Also, contrary to the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 1850, England now opposed all American canal building projects in Central America, and the claim was made in the US Congress that British policy was driven by a desire to restrict US trade with the Far East and reduce the American share of the lucrative China trade¹⁹²,

Salisbury had told Bayard that it would take some time for him to reply to the "twenty-inch gun" note, but he had refused to be more specific. Without informing or even consulting the United States, Salisbury sent a sharp note to Venezuela on October 14, 1895, informing the government in Caracas that England expected an apology and compensation for the arrest of the eight British military personnel (already released) and that England might occupy Venezuela militarily if they refused. A copy of this note was hastily sent to America, and Cleveland's euphoria over Olney's diplomacy diminished when he read the contents. The note was published in the USA. Typical was Lodge's lament in the US Senate: "If we permit the English invasion ... our supremacy in the two Americas will be over" ¹⁹³.

Salisbury's reply to Cleveland

Cleveland expressed anger against England in his annual message to the US Congress on December 2, 1895. Salisbury had not responded to Cleveland's challenge of July 2, 1895, despite Bayard's advice that a reply must be received before Cleveland's annual message. In this message, Cleveland now threatened coercive measures to ensure US influence over the outcome of the seventy-year-old Anglo-Venezuelan dispute. Salisbury's timing was excellent when it came to ridiculing Cleveland: British Ambassador Sir Pauncefoot delivered Salisbury's response to the U.S. State Department on December 6 - four days after Cleveland's congressional message. These were two separate notes from Salisbury: one refuting Olney's claims relating to the Monroe Doctrine, the second rejecting his account of the history of the Anglo-Venezuelan dispute ¹⁹⁴

Salisbury was, in a sense, rapping the presumptuous American leaders Cleveland and Olney on the knuckles - and in brilliant style. England was still the world's leading military power in 1895 and had not feared the USA for a moment since 1776. This was certainly different from the American horror in 1814 when English troops drove Dolly Madison, the First Lady beloved by the entire USA, out of the White House before burning it down along with the rest of Washington/D. C. burned to the ground. Copenhagen Jackson, the English envoy until 1812, reported to London that Dolly was forty, fat and not pretty, and it was only to erase this image that Hollywood later gave the role of Dolly

Madison to the glamorous Ginger Ragers. England was not a middle-American banana republic that could be easily pushed around. Salisbury "rejected Olney's claim" that European colonies in America were under an imaginary supreme jurisdiction of the United States based on natural law.

The Mooroe Doctrine of 1823 clearly states that the USA would not interfere in then existing European colonies in the Western Hemisphere. "Salisbury pointed out that, under existing international law, there was no connection between the unilateral American Mooroe Doctrine and the Anglo-Venezuelan dispute, as this related to a region where there had never been treaty boundaries and therefore the doctrine's objection to the establishment of new European colonial systems was not applicable. The British Crown Colony of Guiana was almost two hundred years older than the state of Venezuela. In this way, Salisbury became the first foreign statesman to publicly state the nature of the Mooroe Doctrine as a mere statement of US policy. Since then, no attempt has been made to incorporate or even mention this doctrine in US treaty agreements with European states. Salisbury flatly denied "that the doctrine is part of international law"^^

Salisbury's second note corrected Olney's "inaccurate historical account"^. Scruggs' book had been Olney's only source, but he was unable to correctly interpret the facts taken from it. Because England had never and nowhere committed to any forced arbitration by treaty until 1895, Salisbury flatly refused to let the U.S. or anyone else arbitrate England's territorial claims to Venezuela. Salisbury told the US that England was entitled under international law to intervene militarily against Venezuela because it was guilty of an offense under international law for "inadequately protecting life and property."¹ ^

A diplomatic disaster

Cleveland had left on December 5 to hunt ducks in North Carolina, and it was part of Salisbury's perfect timing that his note was delivered the day after Cleveland's departure from the American capital^. This made it possible for Olney to once again shoot off his mouth and hastily put a "defiant rejoinder"i99 to paper. Cleveland returned exhausted from his duck shoot on December 15. He read through Olney's letter the following day and approved it after making only a few minor changes to the wording. Cleveland published both notes on December 17 and sent Olney's new note to the U.S. Congress as an official statement of U.S. foreign policy.

Cleveland's move on December 17 made him a laughingstock around the world. Americans had always complained that they were not taken seriously by Europeans, and Cleveland's laughable performance certainly did nothing to

change that. Cleveland was unable to refute any of Salisbury's facts, and Olney's second note merely repeated inanely the errors that had exposed Cleveland to ridicule. The same situation was repeated with perfect precision on April 15, 1937, when FDR sent public messages to Germany and Italy that were literally riddled with grotesque factual inaccuracies. This was nothing special for FDR, as he could easily get away with such things in the US, where the intellectual level of public criticism was still very low. Eyewitnesses recalled FDR's tantrum on hearing the translation of Hitler's Reichstag speech of April 28, 1939, in which he - like Salisbury in his note of 1895 - calmly and patiently corrected the countless errors in the morbid American world view. Olney, in his second note endorsed by Cleveland, "insisted that the Monroe Doctrine was, of course, a part of international law and applicable to the boundary dispute "200^ With papal infallibility, he declared that the United States was "bound to determine the true boundary by impartial examination. "20^ Cleveland asked the U.S. Congress on December 17th to appropriate money for a unilateral border dispute settlement. On December 17, Cleveland asked the U.S. Congress to appropriate money for a unilateral American commission and for the publication of any findings the commission would produce, not hiding the real purpose of all this: "When this report is made and adopted, it will, I think, be the duty of the United States to consider the appropriation by Great Britain of lands which, according to this report, belong to Venezuela, and her exercise of governmental authority there, as a willful attack upon the rights and interests of the United States, and to resist it by all means in her power. "202^ In this way, Cleveland threatened to plunge the U.S. into war because of the insufficient information and euphoria he shared with Olney.

Had not the British armed incursion into Transvaal in December 1895 ended in a miserable fiasco thanks to Boer belligerence, Salisbury might have appealed further to Cleveland, but realpolitik took precedence with Salisbury, and the British seizure of the lush gold and diamond mines of Boer country took precedence over the still largely unknown and untapped treasures of the Orinoco Basin. ^{suc}Campbell notes that "no country could impose a British ^{Gren} ze on Queen Victoria's Britain without running a serious risk of war "203, ^{un}d had the USA made an actual - and not just verbal - move in this direction, London would have regarded it as an act of war. Certainly, Congress voted for a unilateral commission including 100,000 dollars for its costs, and the New York "Herald" announced on December 18, 1895 that the American Irish National Alliance was offering 100,000 men for the conquest of Canada. Pauncefoot was not exaggerating when he reported to Salisbury that Cleveland's "warlike message" in America "has produced a state of mind which can only be described as hysterical. "204 However, the detour to war via the American Boundary Commission also gave the powerful Anglophile group in the USA enough time

to challenge Cleveland's account of the situation.

Kaiser Wilhelm left as scapegoat

American jingoism prompted powerful British investors to speculate on bear markets on December 20, 1895, at a time when the American economy was at the bottom of its crisis. "A panic swept through Wall Street, and prices plummeted on the New York Stock Exchange "20⁵ ^ The flight of gold to England caused American gold reserves to shrink to a tiny 63 million dollars. Both J. P. Morgan and J. D. Rockefeller condemned Cleveland's chauvinism and demanded a quick settlement with England. Cleveland had to send another special message to the US Congress as quickly as possible, dealing with "the disastrous financial situation "206 . Anglophile clergymen all over the USA condemned Cleveland as a thoughtless warmonger, and even the chaplain of the US Senate joined in a public prayer for peace207^.

The crisis continued to flare until January 3, 1896, when Kaiser Wilhelm II, a constitutional monarch with limited power, was forced over his objections by Marshal, the State Secretary of the German Foreign Office, and other German bigwigs to publicly congratulate President Ohm Paul Krüger of Transvaal on repelling the British invasion of Boerland'. This blunder by the Hohenlohe government in Germany gave Cleveland breathing space in America. The public move in Berlin in favor of Kruger had bad consequences in every direction. It unfairly gave the peace-loving Kaiser a reputation for reckless diplomacy. English propagandists piled lie upon lie over the next twenty-two years until the Kaiser's deposition in 1918 to reinforce this reputation. For example, in 1900, at the time of Waldersee's expedition against the rebellious "Boxers" in China, an English journalist invented the nonsense that the Kaiser had advised the German soldiers to behave like Huns in China. The Krüger telegram only hastened the Boers' doom by suggesting that the British should wage a major war of annihilation against them before Germany could intervene. This led to the bloody Fourth Anglo-Boer War of 1899-1902 with its countless English atrocities against innocent civilians.

The German diplomatic blunder of 1896 raised the spectre of a German military threat against England's imperialist ambitions and paved the way for the Anglo-American diplomatic alliance forged after President McKinley's inauguration in 1897 - an alliance that has proved disastrous for the whole world to this day. Worst of all, the Kruger Dispatch was a blow to Lord Salisbury's traditional foreign policy of "Splendid Isolation". He had preached to his countrymen for decades that, given the modern maze of entangling alliances introduced by Bismarck after 1871, "Splendid Isolation" was more

advantageous than ever because it gave Britain the flexibility to pursue its policy of equilibrium. Salisbury remained in office until the end of the Boer War in 1902. His own belief in "Splendid Isolation" remained intact, but younger leaders, such as Joseph Chamberlain and Arthur Balfour, took advantage of the Kruger Telegram as a godsend: they believed that England needed allies, and Lord Lansdowne and King Edward VII actually inaugurated this alliance policy in 1902. None of the articles in the London "Saturday Review" calling for the destruction of Germany for England's supposed economic benefit had appeared before 1896.

The imperialist alliance England-USA

Arthur Balfour, the English Tory who later gave away Arab Palestine^{an} d^{as} Zionist world Jewry, was the majority leader of the British House of Commons at the beginning of¹⁸ 96. In his pro^{gramm}atic foreign policy speech in Manchester on January 15, 1896^{erkl} ä^{rt}e he unapologetically declared that ^{the} time had come for English and American statesmen to call for worldwide cooperation between the ^{USA} and Great Britain and "to proclaim the doctrine ^{that} war between English-speaking peoples is impossible" 20B.

The British Colonial Secretary Joseph Chamberlain was the first to support Balfour's Manchester speech. He would "look with horror on fratricidal strife" but "look forward with pleasure to the future possibility of the Star-Spangled Banner and the Union Jack fluttering together in the defense of a common cause, approved by humanity and justice." 209 This cheap propaganda drive set the stage for the carnage that has aided the regression to barbarism and the decline of the West in the 20th century. The corrupt and depraved USA was only used for the worldwide imperialist conspiracy of the British leaders.

Michel-Guillaume Jean de Crevecoeur²¹⁰ proved in 1782 that the colonies revolting against England at the time were not made up of Englishmen who had risen up against their mother country, but of "new American people" whose ancestors were partly English, partly French, German, Scottish, Irish, Welsh, Swedish, Finnish and Dutch. Seven colonial generations had created a new type of people in America, and the idea that the American colonists were "English in America" should be long dead. The Boers in South Africa, who had been down there for ten generations by the time of the Fourth Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902), spoke the same Dutch as the Dutch and the majority of Belgians, with local variations, but the Boers were racially Dutch with French and German admixture, the "Afrikaans" - just as the Americans represented a new type of people in their own right. It was nonsense to talk of an identity in 1896 between English-speaking nations that had ceased to exist five generations earlier. The USA of 1896 had more German and Irish blood than English. Irish-Americans'

justifiable resentment of England after 700 years of persecution was generally understood, and German-Americans, justifiably proud of the new Bismarckian German Empire, had no desire to join an English crusade to destroy Germany. Professor Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker of Princeton University pointed out²¹¹ that in the war of 1775-1783, the Scottish-Americans were the real backbone of George Washington's armies against the English. Sweden and Germany, on the other hand, were the best of friends in 1896, and official Sweden remained pro-German throughout the First World War. There was no rational basis for deploying millions of Swedish-Americans to destroy Sweden's friend against Russia, namely Germany. The British unrestricted V-boat war in the Baltic cost the Swedes more ships than the US lost to German U-boats during the entire First World War.

Balfour and Chamberlain's stance against Salisbury's "Splendid Isolation" was sordid and depraved, as these two bloodthirsty scoundrels knew full well that the crude Kruger Dispatch was neither illegal nor inappropriate and posed no concrete military challenge to England at all. WH- helm II was Queen Victoria's favorite grandson, and both Balfour and Chamberlain knew from personal contacts with him that no foreign ruler could be friendlier to England. The British Jameson invasion of Transvaal in 1895 was a heinous international crime, and public criticism of it in Germany, France, or Russia gave England no right to contemplate the destruction of any of these critics. The whole swindle of unscrupulous English imperialism had become a sordid perfidy, and the name of England was a word of horror in the everyday language of underprivileged countries all over the world. The list of previous American imperialist misdeeds was bad enough before they joined forces with the English and opened a new horror chronicle of Anglo-American imperialist crimes that has since stained the pages of the book of 20th century world history.

Worst of all was the American tendency since 1896 to adopt the British policy of propaganda lies and the vilification of any country that did not speak English. It is both just and a blessing that the military and political power of the English-speaking states is now in decline. The ordinary Englishman and American may have had no say in the foreign policy decisions of their respective countries, but that does not alter the fact that the Anglo-American alliance of 1896 was made in hell and its achievements were the worst ever accomplished by any alliance in the history of mankind.

Venezuela dropped
in favor of the alliance with England

Britain and the United States were aggressively expanding imperialist systems in 1896, whose intentions and plans could intersect at a hundred points, so the Venezuelan crisis gave rise to the demand for a general arbitration treaty.

Venezuela had to accept that it would not receive the kind of American support against England that Cleveland and Olney had offered. The Anglo-American supreme agreement on Venezuela reached on November 12, 1896, gave England 90 percent and Venezuela 10 percent of their respective claims. In the treaty concluded between Great Britain and Venezuela, the USA did not appear as a third party, and Salisbury made it clear in a letter to the London "Times" on November 11, 1896, that his diplomacy had triumphed over Cleveland and Olney as far as the Monroe Doctrine was concerned: "England has done nothing to accept or support the Monroe Doctrine. The situation is as it was before the controversy began" ²¹².

The British had delayed the conclusion of the Supreme Convention until Bill McKinley had defeated Bill Bryan in the US presidential election of November 1896. Only then were they sure that the plutocratic and Anglophile boss of the Republicans, Mark Hanna, would permanently control US foreign policy. Campbell notes that "Venezuela had been pushed aside." ²¹³ Venezuelan sensitivities did not count. All of Latin America hated the USA. The now American-Venezuelan tension made it possible for England to take the lead in exploiting Venezuela's gold, mineral and oil deposits from 1896 onwards. According to the official British view, the USA consisted of an inferior colonial population that would only do anything if it served British interests. The British attitude towards the USA after 1896 was similar to that of Israel towards the USA in the middle of the 20th century: it was arrogant, condescending and incessantly demanding. The Venezuelans read Salisbury's harsh treaty terms in disgust, but under British pressure they signed on February 2, 1897 ²¹⁴.

The "Maine" incident

Hanna submitted the Anglo-American Arbitration Treaty to the US Senate immediately after McKinley's inauguration on March 4, 1897. Only two votes were cast against the treaty from the East Coast, but it was nevertheless defeated on May 5, 1897 by no votes from the American Midwest and Far West. Assurances were given to England that the American media would continue to campaign for the treaty and that it would be accepted after the 1898 elections ²¹⁵. Jewish agitators had again succeeded in setting fire to Cuba in 1895, and Mark Hanna allowed the revolutionary situation on the island to mature during 1897, while at the same time smuggling masses of American arms to the rebels. McKinley's foreign policy that year was anti-Spanish and deliberately provocative. He sent the new U.S. battleship Maine to Havana, Cuba, ostensibly to protect American interests, and the ship blew up at anchor on February 16, 1898. 260 members of the American crew were killed in the explosion. The Spanish authorities did what they could in the rescue operations. It has been conclusively established that Spain had nothing to do with the destruction of the

Maine, which was raised in 1911 and carefully investigated for months. Edward Atkinson, a prominent Boston industrialist, formulated the generally accepted judgment that the Maine was destroyed from within by a combination of gas and electricity. Spain would have been the last in the world to have a motive for destroying the ship, but that didn't stop the Hungarian Jew Joseph Pulitzer-the wealthiest and most successful American journalist of the time-from claiming that Spain was guilty-and 90 percent of the American media followed suit, openly and shamelessly agitating for the cowardly and unnecessary war between the powerful United States and^{de} r decrepit Spanish monarchy²¹⁶.

The Madrid government capitulated to the official ame^{k^{ria}} nical demands on April 9, 1898 and agreed to cease all mi^{lit} ercial operations against the Cuban rebels. In this way, the American invasion a few days laterⁿ became a cowardly attack on an already defeated enemy. Shortly before the destruction of the Maine, the New York Journal published a private letter from Dupuy de Lôme, the ni^{spac} envoy to the USA, to a Spanish friend in Cuba on February 9, 1898. This letter had been stolen by the US Postal Service in violation of international law. There was nothing special about it, except that it revealed an unfavorable assessment of President McKinley - but after all, his own Vice President, Teddy Roosevelt, had already complained that the President had "no more backbone than a chocolate pudding^^ The US authorities did nothing against the Journal for its shameless violation of international law. The rest of the American media even praised the Journal for allegedly exposing Spanish perfidy^{2^}

The unprovoked aggression against Spain

McKinley rushed to deliver his unfinished war message to Congress on April 11, 1898 - two days after the Spanish surrender. His call to attack Spain was approved, and the Senate voted 67-21 to recognize a new Cuban regime under US control²¹⁹ The US also decided to trample on the Monroe Doctrine by seizing the Spanish Philippines in Asia and setting in motion an extensive program of American colonial acquisitions in the Eastern Hemisphere. Official America had persuaded itself that the key to worldwide success in the future lay in emulating the worst excesses of British overseas imperialism^{220^} The fighting had been going on for many days when, on April 25, the US Congress finally took the trouble to pass a resolution on the colonialization of the Eastern Hemisphere. Congress finally bothered to issue a formal declaration of war to Spain on April 25²²¹ The first war news to reach the US was that Admiral George Dewey had defeated the Spanish naval forces at Manila - 8000 miles away from the supposed object of the war, Cuba. "The American public was astonished: few had heard of Manila and that there were Spanish colonies there^{222^} Secret orders for this operation had already reached Dewey in

Nagasaki, Japan, on February 25, 1898 - two months before the American declaration of war. It was not known to the public that American agents had been campaigning to take the Philippines from Spain since 1876. Understandably, the majority of the Filipino population hated the USA because this foreign power wanted to enslave them _COPY^r. Dewey reported laconically on the attitude of Emilio Aguinaldo, the George^e Washington of the Filipinos: "I ^{think he} regrets that our troops are here "223[^]

In the course of the US war against Aguinaldo in 1898-1901, British, Japanese, French and German warships were dispatched from time to time to protect the interests of their own nationals. The commander of the first such British ship was authorized to declare that Britain would happily annex the 7000 islands if the US did not want them. The other powers had more limited interests, but the British concocted the absurd propaganda lie that a German ship had intended to attack American ships, but had abandoned that plan because of the presence of British warships. This hoax was printed in thousands of American textbooks and is still widely believed in the USA today224

Hawaii, which had been subjugated earlier by U.S. Marines, was formally annexed by the United States on August 12, 1898225[^] LaFollette was still fully engaged in consolidating the Progressives' position in Wisconsin at the time, so it was left to William Jennings Bryan to lead the federal fight against the mad scheme of Hanna, McKinley and Teddy Roosevelt to annex the Philippines. The evildoers defeated Bryan after a tough fight and misled Congress into approving annexation on Feb. 6, 1899. Bryan's response was to run for the presidency in 1900 on a Democratic platform that called for the reassignment of the Philippines. Once again defeated, Bryan dropped the issue, whereupon Fighting Bob LaFollette took up the fight and did not give it up until his death in 1925. The Monroe Doctrine had become an empty shell226[^]

The Monroe Doctrine loses its meaning

The "Latinos" had always hated this doctrine, but this hatred became a frenzy with the Roosevelt Corollary of 1905. Teddy arrogantly complained about Latin America: "These miserable republics are giving me a lot of trouble. "227 He informed the US Senate that in future he would invade any Latin American country that did not comply with its international^{Ve} obligations without a declaration of war. ^{setz}As he put it: "Under the^{Mo} roe doctrine, the United States cannot stand by while a European^{Mac} ht occupies and permanently occupies the territory of one of these republics; and yet such an occupation - overt or disguised - may ultimately provide the only means for the power in question to

collect debts unless the United States intervenes in time".²²⁸

The Monroe Doctrine was stripped of all meaning by the American annexation of the Philippines. Teddy, however, used its rotten corpse for a state of permanent undeclared war between the United States and its twenty Latin American neighbors. This satanic policy of perpetual American military aggression was doubly criminal in light of Teddy Roosevelt's hypocritical posturing as a defender of the Latin American peoples he despised. A few months earlier, in November 1903, Teddy had robbed Colombia of its Panama territory. That was an everlasting slap in the face for Colombia's pride. Alexander von Humboldt (1769-1859) - brother of Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835), the founder of Berlin University - had traveled all over Latin America for five years (1799-1804) while it was still Spanish. His recommendation of a Panama Canal was not only praised by his friend J. W. Goethe, it was also officially adopted by the new Colombian government in the first decade of independence. Negotiations between the Colombian Santander dictatorship and various European states to finance the canal construction project took place in 1833, but at that time no foreign capital could be secured.

The USA takes over the completion of the Panama Canal

Gold was discovered in California in 1848, but the canal had still not been built. Thousands of fortune hunters crossed the 47-mile-wide Isthmus of Panama on foot to reach the Pacific Ocean and the coastal ships to California. Now the British made a clever move to forestall an American seizure of Panama. In the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 1850, the USA agreed with England that a future Panama Canal, which would be built with Colombia's consent, should be jointly controlled. The British reached a similar agreement with the French when construction work began on a canal under French auspices in 1878, but Jewish speculators "diluted" the canal company's share capital and bankrupted the company in 1889. A new French company liquidated the assets - except for the canal concession, which Colombia had sold to the French²²⁹.

After the American war with Spain and the participation of the USA in the suppression of the Boxer Rebellion in China, Teddy Roosevelt negotiated the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty with England (1901), which guaranteed special British privileges in a Panama Canal to be built under American auspices. In January 1903, the Hay-Herran Treaty with Colombia offered the canal concession to the USA for a cash payment of 10 million dollars and an annual payment of 250,000 dollars. As in the USA, however, approval by the Colombian Senate was required for ratification. The Colombian Senate now considered the price too low for a ten-kilometer-wide canal corridor, and it therefore voted to renegotiate

the treaty on the basis of "more generous terms. "230 Teddy's reaction to this was an _undeclared blitzkrieg: "the occupation of the entire Panama region, defeat of the Colombian forces seeking to regain the territory, and creation of a sham American protectorate in Panama. " This was one of the most cold-blooded international crimes of the 20th century231.

When Teddy Roosevelt demanded the right to invade any Latin American country at whim and discretion in 1905, he unveiled an appalling US foreign policy of piracy and lawlessness. The corrupt US Congress rushed to accede to Teddy's demand, and so the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine remained official American policy until the Chapul- tepec Conference after World War II. Events after 1945 also proved that it is still the de facto policy of the USA today. Accordingly, the Latin American states have never been able to enjoy the full sovereign rights to which free and independent nations are normally^{we} entitled232.

The Paris Peace Treaty; the USA acquires colonies

^{mat}The Treaty of Paris, which ended the war against^s pania on December 10, 1898, was typical of the John Hays era in the US diplomacy, which was continued by his successors as Secretary of State, Elihu Root and^p hitaoder Knox, until the arrival of Wilson in 1913. The USA took Puerto Rico, Cuba and the Philippines from Spain. Puerto Rico was openly annexed as a colony, Cuba became a permanent protectorate of the USA under the so-called Platt Amendment, which remained in force unchanged until 1934. The two aims of Hay's policy were: to take possession of everything within reach for the USA and at the same time to support British interests all over the world.

Hay wanted an American policy of constant English-style global interference and was therefore enthusiastic about Teddy Roosevelt's brutal policy. He displayed an autocratic contempt "for most members of Congress233". Hay had himself become a plutocratic miscreant through his marriage to a wealthy heiress, and Campbell aptly characterized him as a man of "pro-British, Anglo-Saxon and expansionist prejudices "234.

The John Hays era was the autocratic period of dollar diplomacy and the sheer joy of exercising superior power. The Wilson era, which followed in 1913, retained Hay's Anglomania but was more complex in its hypocritical democracy phraseology and its passionate devotion to subversive Jewish programs such as Bolshevism and world Zionism. The Hay era marked a departure from American interests, the Wilson era the betrayal of those interests.

Hay's Open Door Policy in the Far East (1900) was based on the premise that England should rule China as a permanent colony, not unlike British India, and that the influence of Russia, France and Germany in China should be minimized. The British had done their brainwashing on Hay when he served in London in the 1890s. Hay's chief adviser on the Far East, Rockhill, received his instructions directly from Hippisley, the British diplomatic trouble-shooter Nwnmer One in China. Hippisley had provided the text for Hay's famous first "open-door" note on China, dated September 6, 1899, as part of a campaign to win international recognition that the whole of China had become a special British sphere of influence. This note was originally addressed to England, Germany and Russia, and on November 21, 1899 also to France, Italy and Japan²³. Hay was a liar like Teddy Roosevelt. His original note was sharply rebuffed, but on March 20, 1900, "Hay mildly announced that all had replied satisfactorily."²³⁶ The British had figured out that Hay was a shallow snob and amenable to their flattery, and it had been a cheap trick by England to officially endorse the American war of aggression against Spain in 1898. The British ambassadors in Washington/D. C. and Madrid reported confidentially to Salisbury that the USA had behaved criminally in unleashing the war, and Pauncefoot secretly tried to persuade his diplomatic colleagues in the USA to protest against the American mistreatment of Spain, but Salisbury allowed Joseph Chamberlain to publicly praise the Yankees to the skies. The British Permanent Foreign Office launched a campaign in the English press praising the good English-American understanding²³⁷. In this way, London flattered the USA in 1898 and persuaded Hay to do the dirty work for British imperialist aggression in China. This anti-Chinese US diplomacy became a permanent obstacle to Sino-American relations in the following decades²³⁸.

Nothing revealed more fully the fatuousness of American Far East diplomacy than the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905. Because Hay and his colleagues had done what John Quincy Adams had warned against three generations earlier, namely making the United States a servile dinghy in the wake of the British ship of the line, official America supported every criminal British move in Asia, including the Anglo-Japanese military alliance of 1902, which was intended by London only to trigger a major war in the Far East, with the Japanese and Russians fighting and the goal being the reduction of Russian influence. President Teddy Roosevelt blindly followed England all the way to the Portsmouth Conference in 1905, where he got himself into deep trouble with Japan. The blind faith in perfidious Albion that had gotten him this far was more to be rebuked than pitied.

Americans force the "opening" of Japan in 1853

^{ti}Although the US began to engage with Japan later than other Western nations, it was undoubtedly the hand-waving American military intimidation of Japan in 1853 that led directly to modern Japanese imperialism. This includes the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895, the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905, the annexation of Korea by Tokyo in 1910, Japanese military aggression against Germany in 1914, the attempt in 1916 to replace England as the leading exploiter of China, and subsequent efforts to create an East Asian "prosperity sphere" with direct Japanese control over more than a billion Asians²³⁹.

When the US forces struck Tokyo in 1853 - a semi-feudal city with a population of one million at the time - "the temple bells tolled to warn of the invasion"⁴⁰. Japan, which had once been in lively contact with the West, had isolated itself for eight generations; but Yankee merchants, who had grown rich from the China trade, persuaded U.S. President Pierce to move aggressively against the passive Japanese empire in the expectation that American trading bases in Japan would increase Yankee profits in the Far East. The American victory of 1853 did not cost much, as the trading privileges and coaling stations were available for "bluff and bluster"²⁴¹.

Perry's invasion "sparked the most remarkable industrial and national revolution in history,"²⁴² but Japanese Foreign Minister Matsuoka viewed it somewhat differently when he told American correspondents in 1934 that the British and Americans had taught Japan modern imperialist poker, but complained after World War I that Japan continued to play by their own rules. The American methods of 1853 were not those of friendly persuasion, and later England took the Japanese under its wing and supported Japan's early campaigns against Korea, China, Russia and Germany. Worst of all was the propaganda opinion in World War II that Britain and the US were special friends of China and were horrified by the prospect of modern Japan abusing China. This was a lie that could only be expected to be believed by fools, including some of the American public²⁴³.

England and the Russo-Japanese War

The Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905 was a major war, and the Battle of Tsushima (1905) was a considerably larger naval battle than the Battle of the Skagerrak (1916) and was the most extensive naval action up to the Second World War and its Battle of Leyte (1945) between the American and Japanese fleets. The war achieved the scale and results desired in London and was an integral part of the British plan to destroy the Romanovs and Hohenzollerns. London provoked Japan to attack Russia and at the same time negotiated the Anglo-French Entente cordiale of 1904. France and Russia had been official

military allies for ten years, and Japan would never have dared to strike against Russia if France had not been neutralized by England. Because Tsarist Russia was largely ruled by ethnic Germans, and because Germany and Russia were natural partners both militarily and economically, Britain wanted to contain Russian imperialist ambition until it exploded against Germany. Neither France nor Russia were likely to attack Germany alone after 1904, and the foreign policy of the Berlin-Vienna-Rome Triple Alliance was entirely defensive. Britain was determined to turn the Franco-Russian Dual Alliance into an offensive alliance by joining it. It gained France through British support for French aggression in Morocco. But the agreement with Russia, which England finally obtained in 1907, was more difficult to achieve and would have proved impossible had England not called on Japan to undermine the Russian position in the Far East in favor of British supremacy in China.

The cordon sanitaire against Russian expansion in the Far East l^enced Russian imperialist energy back into Europe. It^e also proved necessary for Britain to block Russian ambitions^{na} ch the Turkish straits and Constantinople - where^{De} Germany had no objection to Russian plans - because^{sic} h might otherwise have directed Russian energy southwards towards British possessions^{gen} in the Middle East instead of against Germany.^{En} gland's success in all these endeavours resulted in the First World^e g War and the destruction of Russia and Germany. Both the First and Second World Wars were fabricated in London alone^{244^}

Britain's greatest risk in the Russo-Japanese War was that a frustrated Tsar Nicholas II might be persuaded by his peace-loving cousin Kaiser Wilhelm II to organize a defensive military alliance between the German Empire, Russia and France. The Kaiser actually seized this opportunity skillfully and achieved the Russo-German Treaty of Bjorkö of 1905, but the results were undone by the stupidity of the German Chancellor von Bülow, and so the great British gamble to encourage the Japanese attack on Russia from the outset - including the building of the entire Japanese offensive fleet in England - became a phenomenal success. Britain's only problem was to give Russia the breathing space it needed to rearm after its defeat in 1905, until the onslaught of the mighty British alliance against encircled Germany could begin in 1914. This was not a serious problem, however, given Germany's consistently peaceful foreign policy and the German desire to improve its diplomatic relations everywhere. This ruled out the possibility that German "Realpolitik" could use the period of insufficient Russian readiness for war to wage a preventive war - of the kind that Frederick the Great had undertaken in 1756 at the beginning of the famous Seven Years' War²⁴⁵.

However, lest anyone assume that the disgraceful events from the defeat of

the Boers and the conclusion of the Anglo-Japanese alliance to Britain's harnessing of France in 1904 and Russia in 1907 were unique in British diplomacy, reference should be made here to an exhaustive overview of British misdeeds from the pen of Quincy Wright, an outstanding American expert in the field of international law²⁴⁶. There is also the work of the conservative Jewish expert from Yale University, Edwin Borchard, who replaced John B. Moore as the doyen of American international law experts. In his book²⁴⁷ (together with w. P. Lage), he demonstrated that the combination of British diplomacy and Woody Wilson's refusal to comply with the principles of international law unnecessarily embroiled the United States in the First World War. Borchard dashed Frank Roosevelt's foolish hopes, Roosevelt's foolish hope that he would be swayed to support his criminal foreign policy simply because he was Jewish, and remained steadfast in his support of solid American neutrality and respect for international law during the pre-Pearl Harbor era despite FDR's countless violations. Qu. Wright's book, published shortly before Pearl Harbor, demonstrated that England had started more wars and participated in more wars than any other nation in recorded history²⁴⁸.

The Warners mention in their book that the Battle of Mukden in 1905 was bigger than any previous land battle in world history and that "for many Asians ... the 1904-1905 war between Russia and Japan was the most important of our time. The pen could thus become the master - and the master the pen. "²⁴⁹ The war occurred precisely in the middle of the USA's imperialist involvement in Asia. From 1784 to 1974, the US was "always deep in Asia", but "today ... it has taken a step back from Asia "²⁵⁰. The blind allegiance of the US to the brutal British foreign policy is now over, the Asians no longer fear the US, and Asia can only bring losses to American imperialism in the future instead of ill-gotten gains. The current unfavorable position of the US vis-à-vis the Far East could only be changed by internal change in the US - and not by the mirage of some accidental military developments in Asia on which official America continues to rely.

Port Arthur 1904 and Pearl Harbor 1941

The Japanese surprise attack on Russia in February 1904 was "the first Pearl Harbor. "²⁵¹ Observers in 1941 were amused by the hypocritical cries of official America that the attack on Pearl Harbor would live on as a day of infamy. In 1904, most of the American media had hailed the attack on Port Arthur as morally justified because the lesser man must land the first blow. Unlike Russia in 1904, in 1941 the US used lazy and unlawful tricks to force Japan into a hostile move that would enable Frank Roosevelt to carry out his

plan to destroy Europe. FDR's plan for the American invasion of Europe was completed before Pearl Harbor²⁵². Regarding Pearl Harbor, Wedemeyer asserts that "Japan's attack was deliberately provoked." ²⁵³ Pearl Harbor was a day of perfidy^{im} in reverse, with the US forcing a reluctant Japan into a^{ne} legal retaliatory attack after every conceivable al^{ter} native to avoid it had been exhausted. But then the^{ve} defense clauses of the 1940 Tripartite Pact came into play, and it was Hitler's and Mussolini's duty to rush to Japan's aid. Later research has shown that FDR was willing to plunge directly into war against the European Axis powers as soon as the blow to Pearl Harbor was struck - whether Germany and Italy came to Japan's aid or not²⁵⁴ .

In 1904 everything was completely different, as Russia had not yet closed the door to a peaceful diplomatic agreement on the conflicting Russian and Japanese claims to spheres of influence, but the Japanese were keen on war because "the psychological support of the alliance with England tempted them to do so" ²⁵⁵.

The peace of Shimonoseki

Port Arthur, a grand naval base with a population of 56,000 at the time, was only too well known to the Japanese. A decade earlier, during the Sino-Japanese War, the Chinese had suffered heavy naval losses in a naval battle at the mouth of the Jalu River in Korea, and the Chinese fleet had taken refuge in their home base of Port Arthur. The port's defensively favorable location and fortifications deterred a direct Japanese attack from the sea, but the Sons of Nippon destroyed the Chinese fleet by taking Port Arthur from the rear by attacking overland²⁵⁶.

The Japanese showed the same cruelty as later in 1937 in conquered Nanking, massacring both the Chinese garrison and the civilian population of Port Arthur, raping and then killing the women in turn. The Japanese excuse for this barbarism-which looked favorable to British observers-was that they wanted to keep Port Arthur and that killing the Chinese was the easiest way to deserted the area²⁵ 7. Tokyo showed the worst side of its greedy character in 1895 when it imposed the Treaty of Shimonoseki on China. China was ousted from its traditional role in Korea and forced to pay a huge indemnity. Tokyo also demanded that China cede Port Artbur - which belonged to China itself - after Japan's friends in London had approved this plan. Russia, however, put a stop to this and obtained the diplomatic support of France and Germany. London now instructed Japan to submit to the demarche of the three powers and wait for better times. The Japanese did so and were later able to pay back the Russians in 1904 and the Germans in 1914. They had to wait until 1941 for revenge on France, when they forced the Vichy regime to allow the Japanese military

occupation of French Indochina. As its own defeat approached in 1945, Japan retaliated further against France by handing over huge quantities of war materiel to the insurgents Ho Chi Minh, who had begun partisan fighting against the French as early as 1931. This Japanese move in 1945 also helped settle the score with the US, as the insurgents, who were first supplied by Japan, later defeated the Americans along with their South Vietnamese puppets - in a fourteen-year final battle that ended in 1975 with the Red Vietnamese conquest of Saigon in former French Indochina. The wheel had once fully turned, with the British already safely withdrawn from the Far East (with the exception of the tiny Hong Kong base temporarily tolerated by Red China for economic reasons), but the Americans took the hits - in a way that undermined American prestige in the world once and for all. In 1975, the USA quickly sank as an imperialist power to where England was in 1945. Like England, the USA is no longer feared, no longer respected.

No sooner had the Japanese been barged out of Port Artbur with French and German help than the Russians wanted to enter this magnificent harbor, which lay far to the south of Vladivostok, the Russians' main base in the Far East, which was frozen over for eight months of the year. The Russians had saved Port Artbur for their Chinese allies, but when the Germans and British leased bases in northern China - the Germans in Kiautschou, the British in Wei-hei-wei - the Russians leased Port Artbur on the pretext of securing Chinese interests in the region. The Japanese were furious. The Russians, however, celebrated their achievement of 1898 by shipping huge quantities of vodka to Port Artbur - of which there was still^c an enormous supply at hand at the time of the Japanese invasion several years later^{2ss}.

Japan's Westernization Program

Each of the Japanese warships used in the 1904 surprise attack on Port Artbur had been built in England after 1899²⁵⁹ The English had also built the first Japanese railroad from Tokyo to Yokohama in 1872, whose trains were driven by English locomotive drivers²⁶⁰. It had once been Portugal that opened Japan to the West for a full century in 1540, but a Shinto reaction to zealous Catholic missionary activity in 1641 forced the country into isolation again for two hundred years until 1853, when Yankee imperialists once again threw open the doors to Western penetration. The difference this time was that in 1868, under the Meiji Emperor Mutsuhito, the Japanese began a Westernization program so thorough that Oswald Spengler equated it to the Japanese takeover of Chinese culture a thousand years earlier^{26t}.

If the Portuguese of the 16th century had been as brutal as the English of the 19th, Japan might have carried out its westernization programme three hundred years earlier, because the only reason behind this programme was the fear that

the English, in their usual genocidal policy against the "inferior races", would exterminate the Japanese just as they had previously exterminated the Polynesian Maori on New Zealand. In 1862, even before Westernization, there had been a secret plan by the daimyos (the 270 leading landowning families of old Japan) to expel the people from the West²⁶². The Satsuma clan, the second richest in Japan, had the best fighters (every third samurai belonged to it). Their headquarters were in Kagoshima on the southern coast of Kyushu. The British learned of the conspiracy and brutally attacked Kagoshima in August 1863. The American Perry Mission of 1853 had brought the West back to Japan, but British aggression ten years later was the real cause of Japanese Westernization, which was fully underway by 1868²⁶³.

Togo Heihachiro, who later drilled the Russian fleet into the bottom at Tsushima as an admiral, fought as a soldier against the British at Kagoshima in 1863. After their victory, the British massacred so many helpless civilians that the Japanese fear of a British policy of extermination was only too understandable. The survivors of the Satsuma went underground and headed a revolutionary secret society against the feudal shogunate in Tokyo²⁶⁴. The revolution with the goal of modernization was eventually successfully implemented after the death of Emperor Komei in 1867. Mutsuhito, the new ruler, was given the name Meiji Mikado (Enlightened Emperor) because he advocated a tightly centralized Japan that embraced the most modern industrial techniques of the West. After the English massacre of Kagoshima, the majority of Japanese realized that the alternative was "modernization or destruction". The constitutional change that began in November 1867 and was completed the following year was called a rebirth rather than a revolution by the Japanese because, like the American Revolution of 1776, the main political thrust had been reactionary rather than radical. These two very similar revolutions were completely different from the radical French Revolution of 1789, not to mention the much worse Russian Revolution of 1917. The two richest clans, the Tschoschu and Satsuma, made a secret deal with the English arms dealer Glover: he was to import modern rifles for them in sufficient numbers so that they could impose their will on the rest of the country - and in return, England would forever be the most favored nation in Japan. So, as so often in history, the English, the most brutal foreign exploiting nation after 1853, were given preference over all rivals because they had terrified Japan - and this fear and the fatalistic mystique that accompanied it only evaporated in the First World War under the impact of English defeats at the hands of Germany. In exactly the same way, the Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese victories over the USA after the Second World War dispelled the fear that Japan had had of the Americans since the Japanese defeat at Midway in 1942. It is doubtful that Asians will fear England or the USA again in the future.

After the abolition of the shogunate and the feudal privileges of the daimyos, Ito Hirobumi of the Choshu clan became prime minister. He consolidated the victory of the new ruling oligarchy in the long term by inventing the myth - which would never have been believed in culturally refined medieval Japan - that Mutsuhito and his ge^{sa} mtes imperial lineage were divine. In this way, Ito^{zu} m became the "creator of the modern god-emperor myth"265. Ito, dearly loved in Japan, had spent decades as a drunken libertine and womanizer, beginning with an early trip to England. He was later appointed Resident General in Korea after the Russo-Japanese War266. Apart from the introduction of the divinity of the Japanese emperor, Ito's modern constitution for Japan was a copy of Bismarck's German imperial constitution. It was a fine thing to have the British as special friends rather than mortal enemies, but Ito had no intention of subjecting the Japanese to the hypocritical trickery of the British oligarchic system of cabinet government267. The Bismarckian system was in essence far more decent and practicable than the British or American systems268.

Ito had no religious inclinations, and he suppressed traditional Japanese Buddhism in favor of the militaristic philosophical Shinto cult of the ruling clans. At his personal instigation, Shinto became the official philosophical ethic of the Japanese state in 1872 (just as Taoism was the traditional ethic of the Chinese state). After 1889, no religion was allowed to be taught in Japanese schools, only Shinto269. China had lost political prestige in Japan when the British devastated, looted and set fire to Beijing in 1860. In 1894, when Japan went to war against China for the first time in three centuries, no Japanese doubted that Japan would inevitably win. In the last conflict in 1592 - during the alliance between Japan and Portugal - China had been victorious270.

No sooner had China been expelled from Korea than Japan sent a special ambassador to Russia, and this -Yamagata proposed - half a century ahead of history - a division of Korea along the 38th parallel - with the southern half, including Seoul, under Japanese influence and the northern half under Russian influence. "271 Had Russia accepted this plan in 1895, England might not have succeeded in using Japan as a tool to weaken Russia's position in the Far East. In the hope of strengthening Russian influence in China vis-à-vis England, Russia's finance minister Witte had financed the huge Chinese reparation payments to Japan in the wake of the 1894-1895 war, but he had enlisted the help of French banking circles who demanded a French railroad network in Korea under Russian political protection, and so the possibility of a Japanese-Russian settlement in 1895 foundered on French resistance. The British pushed for total Japanese control over all of Korea and ordered the Englishman McLeary Brown, who supervised the Korean customs system, to work towards

this goal. When Witte removed Brown under French pressure, the British sent their warships to Intschon, Korea on December 27, 1895, and Russia backed down. Brown's reinstatement made a great impression on the Japanese²⁷².

The British diplomatic game became easier when it became clear that there would be no Russo-Japanese compromise over Korea. Russian influence in Korea increased with the creation of a new Russian East Asia Company, but the Japanese continued to expand their own position in Pusan, South Korea, until the strategic situation changed radically in 1902 with the conclusion of the formal Anglo-Japanese alliance. Japan was soon flooded with British military advisers and was in the midst of preparations for war²⁷³. The day was fast approaching when England would attempt to eliminate the Russian threat to the British colonial empire on the Yangtze River by pitting the Asian Japanese against the Russians in an unusual kind of modern warfare. It was once again a bold experiment by London, and England also used the American Foreign Secretary Hay against the Russians, not only to strengthen England's position in China, but also to encourage Japan's aggressive spirit²⁷⁴.

The Russians in East Asia

The prostrate China, crushed to the ground by the incredible savagery of British imperialism from 1839 onwards, was to be the passive arena of the impending Russo-Japanese war manufactured in England. Unlike the modernized and less civilized Japan, "China relied too long on its cultural superiority." ²⁷⁵ The banishment of Shakespeare from the English stage for six generations from the 18th century showed that the English establishment had an inadequate understanding of its own second-rate culture - and for a 6000-year-old culture like China's, they had none at all. ^{fe} Shortly before China's new total humiliation g^{tiu} ng on the occasion of the so-called Boxer Rebellion of 1900, ^{der} Chinese Prime Minister Li Hung-chang realized that his hopeful policy of getting England out of China with Russian help was not working because of the greed of the Russians. When the Russians demanded a huge extraterritorial zone for the construction of a railroad from Charbin/Manchuria to Port Artbur, Li remarked sadly to the tsar's envoy: "We have let you into the forecourt, now you want to enter the rooms where we have accommodated our women and children." ²⁷⁶ The Wamers were not exaggerating in their book when they stated that British imperialism "brought the ruling Ching (Manchu) dynasty to its knees and to extinction" ²⁷⁷ the moment Russia's support for China was revealed to be futile and self-serving.

Having annexed the eastern third of Manchuria following the criminal British sack of Peking in 1860, the Russians were now intent on controlling the

remaining parts of this land. These remaining two-thirds of Manchuria, half the size of Texas, were "one of the five great parts of China (together with the 18 provinces of China proper, Chinese Turkestan, Tibet and Mongolia - together an area one-third larger than the United States before the acquisition of Alaska)"²⁷⁸. Chinese had been settled in Manchuria since the earliest times, but from 1644 onwards - during the Ching Dynasty - this land was a special reserve of favored Manchus and Mongols.

In the 17th century, the Russians had attempted to invade the border region of Manchuria in the valley of the Amur River (known in China as the Black Dragon River), but they were soundly beaten and chased out by the Manchus in 1683. The Amur "flows 2700 miles above China."²⁷⁹ In June 1689, the Chinese sent a large military caravan with 4000 camels to Nerchinsk, four hundred miles east of Lake Baikal, and there, on August 27, 1689, during the reign of Peter the Great, the Russians pledged never to return to the Amur Valley. However, the Russians were freely granted the right to send trade caravans through Inner Mongolia to Peking².

As the Chinese were not interested in Siberia, the Russian advance into Asia, which had crossed the Urals in the 16th century, concentrated on the north-eastern region above Amur and in particular on the large Kamchatka peninsula. As the Chinese were not interested in Siberia, the Russian advance into Asia, which had crossed the Urals in the 16th century, concentrated on the north-eastern region above the Amur and in particular on the large Kamchatka peninsula, where "the rivers were teeming with salmon, the forests were full of poplars, birches and elder trees - with rhododendrons and wild roses, snipes and grouse, together with the most precious of the fur-bearing animals, the sable, mink and fox, the beaver and the bear"²⁸¹. In the 18th century, the Russian Far East remained the domain of fur hunters, traders and explorers; the first Russian peasant settlers did not appear here until the second half of the 19th century²⁸².

The Russians had used Alaska as a supply base for their fur hunting ventures in California in the early 19th century, but Alaska lost its importance when the Russians ruthlessly exterminated most of California's animal wealth (for example, the hundreds of thousands of otters of San Francisco Bay). The sale of Alaska to the USA in 1867 was not seen as a loss, especially as Tsar Alexander II hoped to involve the USA in resurgent border disputes with the British in Canada. Considering the harshness of Russian rule in Siberia, it seems fitting that it was none other than Ivan the Terrible who launched the first Russian imperialist expansion into the region. Like Elizabeth I of England (whom he had once hoped to marry), this pre-Romanov ruler believed in slave labor and used it extensively in the iron, silver and salt mines of western Siberia^{2BJ}.

As in the case of the US territory, where there may have been less than a million Indians when English Captain John Smith invaded Virginia in 1607, the

indigenous population of Siberia was small in number, making the seizure of empty space as easy as in the case of the US. Siberia was twice the size of the USA, but its total population of Russians and Mongoloid natives was only one and a half million in 1811. This number grew to 4,314,000 by 1885, and the decision was made in St. Petersburg to build a double-track railroad across the whole of Siberia²⁸⁴. The Trans-Siberian Railway made rapid progress once its construction had actually begun in 1891, and the population of Siberia reached six million in 1897. The midpoint of the rail line between Moscow and Vladivostok was at Tomsk.

Russia's conquests in China

Russian aggression was resumed after Perry's American invasion of Japan (1853). Russia's first step was to take possession of the sparsely populated Japanese northern island of Sakhalin before turning against Peking during the Second English Opium War. Alexander II tore up the Treaty of Nerchinsk. Russia occupied the left, northern bank of the Amur and enforced condominium rights over the eastern third of Manchuria between the Amur tributary Ussuri and the Pacific Ocean. Peking, which had been left in the dust by England, had to recognize the new Russian territorial addition in a formal treaty in 1860.

The provisional condominium (joint Russian-Chinese rule) was short-lived, as Russia soon annexed eastern Manchuria. The British destroyed Manchu-Chinese sovereignty once and for all by the dictates of the Treaties of Tientsin (1860), which gave the British extra-legal colonial rights throughout the Yangtze River valley and most other areas of China. France, England's ally in the Second Opium War, also received some of these rights, as did the United States, England's main accomplice since the First Opium War of 1839. Predatory England, with the help of modern technology, had brought down China within a generation - just as the Spanish had destroyed the Aztec and Inca empires in North and South America in the 16th century. Needless to say, British contempt for Chinese culture was surpassed by the Yankees, who had been unsuccessful in developing a culture of their own²⁸⁵.

If one remembers the deep respect of the cultured and civilized medieval Italian merchants for 'Chinese culture, then the contemptuous disdain of the barbarian Yankees for China seems truly pathetic. Incidentally, the American religious missionaries were no less complacent in their contempt for China than the Yankee merchants.

The brutal American and Russian mistreatment of China in the 19th century was a reaction to the British campaigns against China from 1839 - the year in

which Britain also conquered Singapore, which was to become the main base for British imperialism in the Far East until its capture by the Japanese in 1942. Although outnumbered by the British defenders, General Yamashita crossed the Johore Strait under fire, crushing the British and taking a huge number of prisoners - causing considerable damage to London's prestige.

The degrading Amur Treaty, which China ratified in 1860, was negotiated by Count Nikolai Ignatieff, a 27-year-old Russian general and personal friend of Tsar Alexander II.

Ignatieff later brought about the famous Treaty of San Stefano (1878), which was intended to free long-suffering Bulgaria from the Turkish yoke. This was revoked because Benjamin Disraeli, the Jewish Tory Prime Minister of England, disliked the Balkan Christians and loved the Turks.

British barbarism in China; the conquest of Beijing in 1860

Ignatieff was present as a military observer when the British forces attacked Beijing in 1860 and witnessed the catastrophe after the British had taken the city and the Ching government had fled to a mountain hut in Jehol province² ^ In 1860, the imperial palaces in Beijing contained more works of art than the whole of England. Lord Elgin, the British envoy in Peking, had complete authority over the British forces and a comprehensive knowledge of the value of the palaces. Nevertheless, "Elgin ordered the palaces to be destroyed by fire"² ^ The scene was described by Major Charles Gordon, who later became known in the Sudan as the >Chinese< Gor- don: "They covered an area of many miles ... All the treasures of art ...had been accumulated in this glorious serenity ...These palaces were so large, and we were in such a hurry, that we could not plunder them carefully. Masses of golden ornaments were burnt because they were taken for brass. It was ... demoralizing work for any army. Everyone was wildly bent on plundering"²⁸⁸ ^

Ignatieff managed to bring "four chests full of Chinese diplomatic documents relating to Russia to safety"²⁸⁹ ^ Lord Elgin, who mistook the young Ignatieff for an ordinary military observer and not the Tsar's diplomatic plenipotentiary for the Far East, ^{sc}"confided in him"[^] China was then still in the midst of a struggle with the domestic Taiping rebellion in the Yangtze Valley, and Lord Elgin told Ignatieff that he was considering moving the Chinese capital from Beijing to the rebel base at Nanking. Ignatieff noticed that Ba^{to} n Gros, the French envoy in Peking, "was angry with Elgin about the fire"²⁹ ^

Elgin boasted to Ignatieff: As soon as he had a Chinese ma^{ri} onette pretender to a new throne in Nanking^w erding, England could "control China with four gunboats."²⁹² Elgin reacted to Gros' humanitarian ideas with contempt, and it

struck Ignatieff that his host took savage delight in the brutal massacre and plundering enterprise²⁹³.

The "unequal contracts"

Ignatieff hastily contacted Prince Kung, the Chinese Prime Minister, who capitulated to Russian diplomatic pressure on the evening of October 19, 1860, after learning of Elgin's treacherous Nanking project. An Anglo-French ultimatum demanding the supreme power in Peking over Elgin and Gros was due to expire at 10 a.m. on October 20. Ignatieff made it clear to Kung that Elgin hoped this dastardly ultimatum would be rejected so that England could continue its raid under the guise of a full state of war. However, if Kung wisely accepted the seemingly unfulfillable ultimatum, Ignatieff would send Russian support to China to moderate the British treaty terms - just as Emperor Napoleon 111 had come to **Russia's** aid at the Paris Peace Conference in 1856 to eliminate extravagant British demands. Kung agreed, and Lord Elgin signed the Peking Treaty of October 24, 1860, in which he granted the Sino-Russian demand that Peking should remain the capital of China. Hostilities ended without Elgin discovering Ignatieff's secret demands regarding Manchuria, which Kung had agreed to in return for Russian support.

Furious at the acceptance of his ultimatum, Elgin refused to speak a word to Prince Kung at the signing ceremony. Wishing that the Chinese themselves would recognize him as their true sovereign, "Elgin made a triumphal entry into the city (Peking) on a portmanteau borne by sixteen Chinese bearers clad in scarlet. English troops lined the streets and a military band played God Save the Queen²⁹⁴."

The exact opposite was the friendly conversation between Gros and Kung the following day, when the French ratified the Sino-English treaty in a ceremony of their own. Gros "apologized for his un-ceremonial dress". He had lost the matching suit in a shipwreck off the coast of Ceylon²⁹⁵. Kung replied: "Your uniform was robbed by water, mine by fire." ²⁹⁶

Although Kung accepted Ignatieff's extortionate terms, he had not signed an outright treaty to that effect when the British forces cleared the bloodstained and looted ruins of Peking on November 6, 1860. This did not bother Ignatieff, however, as he knew that Kung had been impressed by the influence the Russian had exerted against Elgin. As Kung began to haggle in an effort to moderate one condition or another, Ignatieff realized that Lord Elgin would like nothing better than to return to Peking with the British troops and plunder the city a second time. Thus the Sino-Russian treaty was finally signed under duress on November 1, 1860.

The loss of the ancient Chinese Trans-Amur region was a heavy blow for China. The Russians were now trapped on both sides of the lower reaches of the Amur, a river larger than the Danube. Ignatieff had conquered "a thousand miles of navigable waterway and the land stretching south to Korea" 297. In 1861, the Russians began building a new harbor only 700 miles from Tokyo, which they named Vladivostok 298 on virgin forest land. The surrounding forest was full of tigers, which repeatedly invaded the city in the early days. Vladivostok was fully developed as a naval base by 1872, and as in the case of Port Arthur a generation later, its "bars ...were full of booze, fornication and rowdiness" 299. The official report on the weather in Vladivostok claimed that the spring was short and bright, the autumn short and bright, the summer hot and humid and the winter long and cold - with the Gulf of the Great, adjacent to the port, frozen over from Christmas to Easter, so that all sea traffic was suspended during the winter season³ oo.

China's resistance to Western imperialism

The Taiping Rebellion in central China, sparked by British opium agents, died down in 1865 after claiming twenty million lives-double the death toll of the First World War. Prince Kung desired the modernization of China even before this process had begun across the Yellow Sea in Japan under the Meiji emperors-but then a gorgeous courtesan named Jehonola, daughter of a Manchurian officer, appeared on the scene as China's femme fatale in the manner of the Trojan Helen and the Egyptian Cleopatra of antiquity. She was brought in a red carpet to the ailing Emperor Hsien-feng - a mode of transportation already used by Cleopatra - and bore this supposedly hopelessly impotent young man a son, earning her the title Tsu-h'si (motherly and auspicious). She was the soul of the small Chinese resistance that opposed the British advance on Peking in 1860. After the youthful emperor died, she crushed her rivals in a determined attempt to rule China in a pro-Western direction. Prince Kung was given to understand that he had only the choice of serving Jehonola as prime minister with policies contrary to his own intentions, or being killed - and he chose to serve³⁰²^

When Jehonola's son was declared an adult in 1872, he tried to defy his mother by joining a secret clique of modernists. Their reaction was to seduce the young emperor Tung-tschih into a whirlwind of debauchery, whereupon he fell weakened victim to smallpox (1875). Jehonola now defied the dynastic law of the Chings by bringing her sister's commoner son to the imperial throne. He became Emperor Kuang-hsu, a powerless puppet. The key to Chinese power during the Ching period was the administrative machinery of the eighteen

provinces of China proper, and Jehonola ensured that only her own appointees came to power in the provinces. She also chose Li Hung-chang from Anhwei to succeed Premier Kung, and it was Li who won the final victory over the Taiping rebels in 1865. The same Li also accepted a large bribe from Russia in 1898 before leasing Port Arthur.

Li's favorite assistant was Yuan Shi-k'ai, who served as China's diplomatic envoy in a valiant attempt in Korea to resist the spread of Japanese power. Although Li assured Jehonola that he shared her reverence for the way things used to be, he also convinced her that China could afford a small modern army. Li was a distant admirer of Bismarck (who was eight years his senior) until, towards the end of his career, he managed to visit Bismarck after his dismissal. Li managed to get 50,000 Chinese troops trained by German officers before the 1894 war against Japan broke out. Li had never shared Yuan's opinion that England and Japan should be made to fight each other instead of plundering China.

Li bravely took on the role of scapegoat after China's defeat in 1895. Jehonola had taken the money for munitions purchases from the German admiral of the Chinese fleet to rebuild the Beijing Summer Palace, which had been destroyed by the British in 1860, and now "the European powers, who had been circling like vultures when Japan went to war, were each tugging at their own piece of the corpse"³⁰³. The most important fact, however, remained the British oppression of China, and the new French and German leased territories left the English quite cold, as it was with Pondicherry and Goa, the French and Portuguese leased territories in British India. As long as England retained most of China, it did not mind sharing small morsels with France and Germany and with the Yankee traders backed by American gunboats on all the Chinese rivers. It was the influence of Russia that England feared, for the Russians, who had come long ago and on land in their half-Asian outward appearance, had not treated China as brutally as England had done, and enjoyed some popularity among the Chinese, while England had no sympathy on her side. Using a puppet like the American Secretary of State Hay during the period of the Boxer Rebellion was a valuable source of disquiet for the Russians, but once England entered the Lansdowne era in 1902 and the plan to destroy Germany as well as Russia took shape, an Anglo-Japanese alliance became indispensable³⁰⁴.

Empress Jehonola

England admired Japan's style. The reparations that China^a b 1895 had to pay to Japan were so huge that the total Chinese i^{ss} public revenue in one year amounted to less than half^{su} s, and the Treaty of Shimonoseki stipulated that

Japan could not invade China if the total amount was not in Japanese hands by 1900. What bothered London was the fact that Russia, by advancing the entire reparation sum to China with the help of French banking circles, was encroaching on England's economic sphere of influence in China by levying local taxes and building railroads and other facilities³⁰⁵ England had no intention of interfering in basic Chinese affairs, to share this encroachment on basic Chinese sovereign rights with Russia - a nation that most Englishmen loathed as much as Ireland ever since Prime Minister Pitt denounced the Russians as greedy barbarians in the House of Commons in 1791^{o6}.

Li realized that the financial burdens imposed on the Chinese Empire by England and Japan made it imperative to modernize China in the manner of Japan - regardless of Jehonola's reverence for the feudal Ching system. But Yuan Shik-k'ai, outgrowing his tutelage by Li, warned Jehonola that there was a plan to destroy her position³⁰⁷ Jehonola responded by arresting the puppet emperor and executing fifty-three of his associates. The remaining reform advocates fled - with the exception of Li himself, who knew that he could rely on Yuan's personal protection. The modernization of China was thus postponed, and the Japanese could only congratulate themselves.

Li, who had become a mere straw man for Yuan, came to terms with Germany in Kiautschou, England in Wei-hei-wei and Russia in Port Arthur³⁰⁸ In a secret agreement of April 13, 1898, the Russians conceded to Japan that Japan had become the dominant power in Korea. Witte later claimed that if Russia had taken this agreement as a permanent basis for a program of appeasement of Japan, then seven years later the war that ended with the Russian humiliation might have been avoided - but that was probably just wishful thinking. On Witte's own initiative, Russia had resumed its penetration of China by taking over China's payments to Japan, and that was appeasement of Japan, but not of England, and that was the crucial point³⁰ ^ Dr. George Morrison, the British *trouble-shooter* in the Far East, whose essays appeared in the London *Times*, began in 1898 "to talk of war and to advocate an Anglo-Japanese alliance "³¹⁰^

The Tsarist Empire falls into the English trap

At the end of 1898, the Russians had 20,000 soldiers at their Port Arthur base, and War Minister Kuropatkin openly spoke of an Anglo-Japanese plan to destroy Sino-Russian cooperation. Witte, who did not like Kuropatkin's open discussion of the facts, offered his resignation to Tsar Nicholas I, but was persuaded by him to remain in office. Nicholas, who was a serious student of history³¹¹, was averse to any kind of war during his reign. Advocating world peace was the most important common bond in the personal friendship between the Tsar and the German Kaiser Wilhelm II. Nicholas' difficulties with

Kuropatkin were the same as those of the Habsburg Emperor Franz Joseph with his Chief of Staff Conrad von Hötzendorf, who used to claim that there was no evil in the declining dual monarchy, that could not be cured by a preventive war against Serbia³^ There was a peace monument at the Three Emperors' Corner - the point in Poland where the empires of the Romanovs, the Habsburgs and the Hohenzollerns met - and indeed all three rulers felt personally committed to peace. And yet none of them was destined to end their rule in peace - as a result of decisions made in London and supported by the ruling Anglophile oligarchy of the USA.

Napoleon I was unable to achieve lasting peace with England after his victory over Austria at Marengo (1800). He made three significant attempts, courting England in the most flattering way, but each time the English tried to assassinate him afterwards. One could hardly prove historically that a regent was an incompetent fool because he failed to get peace or keep peace when England did not want it.

To call Nicholas II an incompetent ruler simply because he allowed himself to be entangled by the British in two ruinous wars for their own benefit would be to misjudge the most difficult problem in modern European history up to the end of British power in 1945: How could any European leader live in peace when the English had decided to embroil him in war? How Britain would have behaved if it had not been led by the USA from 1896 onwards is another question: without American support, the pernicious British course would undoubtedly have been very different.

The Boxer Rebellion (1900)

The Russian Cossacks guarding the South Siberian-Manchurian Railway to Port Arthur flew the Russian and Chinese battle flags, but it was exclusively the Russians who were in charge there. In the province of Shantung, where the two great Chinese philosophers Confucius and Meng-tse were born, an important Russian base became increasingly powerful³ ^ In the 19th century, the hardy population of Shantung harbored a particular hatred of the Christian missionaries from all over, who tended to be condescending and complacent. Sometimes these aggressive missionaries provoked reactions of physical violence from the Chinese, and such a situation enabled England to inflict a further humiliation on subjugated China. In June 1900, the English Admiral Seymour, a veteran of the Crimean War of 1853-1856, led an international expedition of 915 Englishmen, 540 Germans, 312 Russians, 158 Frenchmen, 112 Americans, 54 Japanese, 40 Italians and 25 Austrians against Peking to rescue the extraterritorial foreign legations from the young zealots of the "Society of the Harmonious and Patriotic Fist" ("Boxers"). To prevent this advance, Jehonola had the Tsungli-Yamen (the Imperial Foreign Office) assure

the British envoy Sir Robert Hart that the twelve foreign envoys in the capital could leave under safe conduct with those entrusted to them (staff, refugees, etc.). Unfortunately, a drunken Manchurian ensign from the Ching's elite troops murdered the German envoy Baron von Ketteler just as he was on his way to an appointment at the Chinese Foreign Ministry.

There was no proof of the Chinese claim that an agent paid by the British had killed Ketteler in order to influence other envoys in the direction of the British attitude of not leaving Peking, but the result was exactly that: No legation wanted to leave now that they had learned of Ketteler's death. Russia took part in the expedition against Peking only reluctantly and as a pretense, but the tsar's foreign minister, Muraviev, was dying, and his designated successor, Count Lamsdorf, feared that Russia could be betrayed by England and Japan if it was not represented. The Americans participated happily and with the special blessing of John Hay, their hopelessly Anglomaniac Secretary of State. The British-Japanese clique eagerly sent a further 13,000 men to reinforce the expeditionary force, and the USA provided another 2,000 men from its garrisons in China. Russia also sent another 4000 men, and the total reinforcement contingent from France, Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy amounted to 1111 soldiers; additional reinforcements were belatedly sent by Germany, but the operation was already over and a treaty signed when they arrived. Premier Li fled to Canton, where he received Russian assurances that the Tsar would not join an outright English declaration of war on China. Yuan Shi- k'ai remained in the north, where he destroyed the entire Boxer force in Shantung without the help of the West³ⁱ⁴ An English journalist used the Beijing confusion to invent the famous false version of Wilhelm II's address to the German soldiers embarking for China^{3^}.

The troops of the British-led alliance invaded Beijing on August 14, 1900 and routed the foreign legations³ⁱ⁶ that were besieged by the Boxers. Jehonola fled through the lines of foreign troops the day after the city was taken, dressed as a peasant. She reached Sian/Schensi, which thirty-five years later was to become the main strategic base of the Red Chinese. In the end, the involvement of the Russian contingent proved favorable to the Chinese. The Russian commander, General Linjewitsch, ignored the British order to destroy the "Forbidden City" with the Ching palaces, which had been rebuilt at great expense. Linjewitsch forbade entry to the district and his men succeeded in keeping the British out. The rest of Peking was again plundered and destroyed to a considerable extent^{3^}

Intensified plundering of China

China was the last major state with a silver-based currency, and so the silver warehouse in the capital was one of the main targets for the Japanese. They found it and simply shipped it all to Japan as booty. They also shipped all the state's silk and rice supplies to Japan as booty. The English concentrated on confiscating private property and held public auctions of the stolen valuables while the plundering was still going on. They distributed huge sums from the proceeds of the auctions to the younger officers, and even to the officers without a patent, in a scurrilous and provocative manner. Not the slightest effort was made to ensure the civilized conduct of the British troops. In the Warners' book, this special form of English hunting pleasure is characterized as follows: "For weeks, looting and devastation continued. Rape was not an atrocity but a pastime, murder of Chinese an amusement."318

Order and discipline did not return to Beijing until late September 1900, when German Field Marshal Count Waldersee (1832-1904) arrived to take over supreme command of the allied expeditionary forces, following an earlier initiative from London. As soon as Waldersee took over the protection of the Forbidden City, the Russians withdrew their contingent from Beijing, but Russian forces remained spread across Manchuria in northern Beijing. Chinese insurgents had destroyed Russian railroad facilities in the Cnarbin region, and the Cossacks now used this incident as an excuse to destroy most of the Chinese settlements throughout the Amur Valley319. Thus, the Boxer Rebellion was also useful to the Russian authorities in carrying out their plans for an Amur population consisting only of Russian peasants.

The Sino-Russian secret pact of Mukden of November 26, 1900 provided that the Russians could occupy the whole of Manchuria militarily for an indefinite period320. London and Washington/D. C. rejected a demarche by the Russian Foreign Minister Lamsdorf, who demanded an accelerated evacuation of Peking. The barbarian glory of the sack of defenseless Peking in 1900, in which the USA also made enormous loot, cemented a permanent Anglo-American alliance in the Far East that lasted until two generations later the whole of mainland China was in the hands of the Red Chinese. England then allied itself with Red China and stayed out of the American defeats in Korea and Vietnam during the years 1950-1975. But the British experienced their own defeats elsewhere in the joint process of Anglo-American decline321.

231 Europeans and Americans were killed in the campaign against the Boxers in 1900 - not much compared to the countless thousands of innocent Chinese civilians who were violated and massacred by Admiral Seymour's soldiers. Britain dictated the details of the reparations China was to pay to the eight powers, amounting to 336 million dollars.

England also ordered the beheading of all Chinese officials in Shantung and Peking who were accused of any sympathy with the Boxers. Hundreds of these

officials committed suicide when the order became known. Jehonola herself would probably have suffered the same fate in English hands as the Maid of Orleans had she not wisely gone into hiding in Zhensi until 1902. She then returned to Peking and undertook reforms that she would previously have resisted.

Li died in 1901, and Yuan Shih-k'ai succeeded him as Prime Minister and Imperial Viceroy. Yuan disliked the Russian regiment in Manchuria, but was unable to do anything about it. The following year, 1902, Europe was shocked by the British cruelty towards the defeated South African Boers and by the public conclusion of the British-Japanese alliance. It is no exaggeration when the Warners' book states that "Britain had become the most unpopular country in Europe at the beginning of 1902", but England gained strength from the full support of the corrupt United States, and the formidable Anglo-American combination of power was then able to cover a multitude of misdeeds³²²^

England incites Japan against Russia

England trusted that power was stronger than opinion, and so London quickly embarked on a sensational new crime against human civilization: the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905. This war was commonly called "Morrison's War" in London because this official representative had promoted it in exactly the same way that in the 19th century English representatives in Turkey of the ilk of Canning and Urquhart had encouraged wars between Turks and Russians and maintained Turkish oppression of the Balkan Christians³²³.

It was Morrison who suggested that Japan's envoy in Peking, Count Hayashi, should be sent to London to devote himself to warmongering. In order to secure Hayashi's zeal for this business, he was made "the first Japanese Freemason" ³²⁴ in London. Hayashi paid particular attention to the German chargé d'affaires Baron Eckardstein, who had been disrupting Kaiser Wilhelm's pro-English policy since 1898 with doctored reports to Berlin that caused hopeless confusion. Eckardstein was able to assure Hayashi that there was no Russian-German "secret agreement on Ko- rea." ³²⁵ Since London was also eager to neutralize France, Japan could count on the support of the USA and England, while Russia would stand alone in the event of war³²⁶.

Hayashi took advantage of his strategic post in London to spread the nonsense worldwide that "the Koreans were totally incapable of governing themselves" ³²⁷. The Warners state in their book that the British Foreign Office was fully aware that its policy of supporting Japan would turn Korea into a Japanese colony in the long run, but did not care in the least³²⁸. After the conclusion of the formal Anglo-Japanese alliance on January 30, 1902, Hayashi

stated without exaggeration that "the alliance ... stands out in world history. "329 By unleashing Japan against the Russians, London forever shattered Rodyard Kipling's illusion that England was the champion of Europe's traditional global hegemony. No sooner was the alliance safely in the dry than US Secretary of State Hay launched a public diplomatic campaign against the Russian presence in Manchuria in February 1902, while England's supremacy in China was glorified³³⁰.

Although there were individual Japanese politicians in 1903 - Baron Ito was one - who hoped for an agreement with Russia, their influence was undermined by the growing British influence in Japan (not least in the form of a host of British military advisers), and Kuropatkin's prediction that Japanese aggression with British backing was only a matter of time was soon to come true. The Tsar himself hoped for peace, and those of his ministers who considered war inevitable hoped that the conflict could be postponed at least until 1906, so that Russia could overcome the greatest transportation difficulties. On the eve of the Japanese surprise attack, Lake Baikai- Asia's largest lake - was "still the unbridgeable gap in the (Trans-Siberian) railroad line. "331 The tunnels in this region were unfinished when the harsh winter of 1903-1904 set in. Ferries could not be used, and Russian troops rushing east after the Japanese attack in February 1904 had to march across the ice of the Baikai, accompanied by horse-drawn sleighs carrying supplies. Much of the railroad track was shoddily built, and heavy° cargo made the weak points obvious. Worst of all: "To save money, it was only single track "332^ This resulted in delays, with trains from one direction or another having to wait on side tracks.

These weaknesses were only too well known in Russia, where the conflict with Japan was not popular. War Minister Kuropatkin, who visited Japan a few months before the attack, had reported that Japan - encouraged by England - was seething with fanaticism and the public welcomed a war against Russia. The British introduced Japan to the tricks of sabotage and espionage. Long before the attack, Colonel Motojiro, the Japanese military attaché in St. Petersburg, set up an espionage organization that worked to devastating effect after the outbreak of war. There were also attempts to foment an anti-Russian uprising in Poland like that of 1863, when the English were prevented by the Prussian Prime Minister Bismarck and his Alvensleben Convention with the Tsar Liberator from turning the Polish uprising into a new English crusade against Russia³³³.

Despite the many different ethnic groups in their vast empire, the Russians were not good racial anthropologists, and so Japanese agents easily entered the Yalu region as Chinese. Russian land communications were clogged, and it was almost certain that a British-led Japan could not be defeated, even at sea, by a Russia that had been isolated by London. Under British auspices, the Japanese

had "completed their Marioe expansion program in 1902"³³⁴.

The headfall on Port Arthur

In their surprise attack on Port Artbur on the evening of February 8, 1904, the Japanese used the revolutionary new English Whitehead torpedo³³⁵. Their flagship Mikasa had been launched in England in 1900 and was "the largest and most powerful battleship in the world."³³⁶ All ten Japanese destroyers that carried out the torpedo attack were built in England. Just as with Pearl Harbor 37 years later, the attack began on an evening of celebration when the unsuspecting defenders were almost certainly drunk. Dostoyevsky had said of the Russian people two generations earlier: "The mothers are drunk, the children are drunk, Russia is drinking herself to death."³³⁷ The defenders were well supplied with only one thing, "the huge quantities of vodka that flowed over the Trans-Siberian Railway."³³⁸ The Warners were rather understating the case when they said that the Japanese were "far more disciplined and better trained."³³⁹ They added with regard to morale in the Japanese navy: "The officers were confident ... they could defeat the German fleet, the American and French fleets, and could even hold their own against the British fleet, which had been their teacher"³⁴⁰.

It did not help that the active Russian army in 1904 was ten times larger than the Japanese, because Russia was obliged by its alliance with France to have at least 90% of its forces in Europe, and inadequate transportation facilities prevented a major shift of forces. Moreover, it was the naval strategy, not the land strategy, that decided the war. Russia had not undertaken a single major naval operation in its entire history, but Japan had valuable experience from the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895 and had even drawn its conclusions from Hideyoshi's unsuccessful 16th century naval war against Korea and China³⁴¹.

The secret of the extent of the Anglo-Japanese preparations for the inevitable Japanese victory over Russia was closely guarded, so that - with the exception of the British - "the Western diplomats in Tokyo were betting on a Russian victory"³⁴². The surprise attack was undertaken in midwinter, when the Russian bottleneck at Lake Baikai was at its most serious. After capturing Port Artbur, occupying Korea, and sinking all the warships Russia deployed, the Japanese wanted to win a field battle against the Russians on the Manchurian Plain that would lead them to seek peace on Japanese terms. To this end, the Japanese subversive rooting inside Russia, with British support, would do what it could to damage the Tsarist regime³⁴³.

Worst of all for Russia, however, Anglo-Japanese propaganda had an easy time of it in China thanks to the continuing Russian occupation of Manchuria;

although, like India, it was reduced to the status of a colony under British tutelage, "China saw in a Japanese victory her only hope of escaping partition"³⁴⁴. Like the majority of Filipinos under Jose Laurel after the Pearl Harbor attack in 1941, China began "quietly working for the Japanese"³⁴⁵ after Port Arthur in 1904.

Vice Admiral Togo of the Satsuma clan led the strike against Port Arthur. He reminded his officers that they had longed for a chance to attack Russia every moment since the successful Japanese attack on China ten years earlier³⁴⁶. Benefiting from England's military backing, "the nation will now be given a free hand" and will "execute with reverence the imperial order"³⁴⁷ to Russia.

When the Japanese battleships and destroyers attacked Port Arthur, Japan's cruiser squadrons and torpedo boat fleets gathered at Intschon, Korea, to protect the massed transport fleets bringing troops to Seoul³⁴⁸. Togo's right-hand man on the flagship off Port Arthur was the British Captain Pakenham, who had been his advisor during the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895. The two remained together in the new war. They worked well as a team and had many mutual friends in London, where Togo had studied. This Pakenham, with the deceptively simple title of Captain, had previously been the Grand Admiral of the British Fleet in command of all battlecruisers³⁴⁹. Pakenham noted with pleasure that all Japanese "thought it absolutely necessary to strike the first blow."³⁵⁰ His friend Togo epitomized the consummate militarist, and his enthusiasm for him was unbounded: "He is really a noble man."³⁵¹ A single Russian ship, the cruiser Novik, pursued the Japanese destroyers after their successful surprise attack on the swarm of Russian heavy warships at Port Arthur³⁵².

Japan's brilliant strategic position in 1904

As far as practical objectives were concerned, Japan had already won its undeclared war against Russia on the first evening. It was not without reason that the Japanese merchant ships signaled to the navy: "Banzai, Nippon, banzai!"³⁵³ Togo and Pakenham were satisfied and looked forward to further developments with equanimity. In contrast to Pearl Harbor in 1941, where Frank Roosevelt had secretly withdrawn the vital modern aircraft carriers and only allowed the Japanese to sink obsolete battleships, the Anglo-Japanese raid on Port Arthur was a real surprise. Germany and Italy were surprised by Pearl Harbor, but the USA and England had known about it in advance. Moreover, Japan's allies were battered at the time of Pearl Harbor: Italy had suffered only defeats for fifteen months, Germany had suffered enormous losses at Rostov and off Moscow-and the activity of the German treacherous elite was so

pervasive that further German warfare was more of a bad joke than a serious undertaking. Germany had not yet begun full war production, which had already begun in the Soviet Union in 1929, in England in 1938 and in the USA in 1940. The material superiority of the Allies over the Axis from 1941 onwards was so immense as to be almost laughable, and H. G. Wells was right to say that the last years of the war in Europe resembled former British campaigns against stubborn African tribes. The surprise of Pearl Harbor in 1941 was really Japan, not the US: Japan's doom was sealed the moment it was forced to strike by FDR's illegal blockade. After Pearl Harbor, Japan no longer had a chance-just as there was no hope for the Axis in Europe once the German treasonous elite derailed Hitler's victorious campaign in the Soviet Union in the summer and fall of 1941. Pearl Harbor was not a gamble for Japan, but suicide.

How pleasantly different was Japan's situation thirty-seven years earlier! The strike against Port Artbur is probably best described as a real pleasure. First of all - unlike in the case of Pearl Harbor - there was no real reason for the attack: an agreement could have been negotiated with Russia at any time, had it been wanted in Tokyo or London. Japan's attack on Port Artbur was similar to the American surprise attack on Manila six years earlier (1898), after Spain had already diplomatically capitulated to the USA on the Cuba issue. No one can estimate what the Filipinos - and not only the Spanish - suffered as a result of the American invasion of Manila. Significant development had taken place in the Philippines during the fifteen generations of Spanish rule, and there was no excuse whatsoever - apart from the Monroe Doctrine - for the treacherous aggression of the US against the Spanish and Filipinos in this Asian region. On the island of Luzon alone, more than half a million Filipino civilians died at the hands of American soldiers during the three-year War of Independence from 1898-1901³⁵⁴ No wonder, then, that in 1904 the official United States greeted the Japanese surprise attack on Russia with wild joy and approval. American gifts of gratitude - including free coal - poured into Japan³⁵⁵

Russia almost completely isolated

Secondly, Japan had no allies in trouble in 1904. Japan had the support of the USA and the rich British Empire, which held a third of the world under its control. France, which in 1904 obtained England's consent to the elimination of Morocco's internationally guaranteed independence, left Russia to its fate. (The Morocco Treaty of 1880 - similar to the Treaty of Belgium of 1839 - guaranteed the country's perpetual independence and neutrality. No British official cared to tear up a treaty signed voluntarily twenty-four years earlier. England at all times assumed the right to break any kind of treaty³⁵⁶).

In short, it is just a silly legend that assigns the Japanese the role of underdog in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905. The outcome was never in doubt, and

if Japan had actually got into serious trouble, Britain and the USA would have stepped in. In those days of two-dimensional warfare, the only option was a naval attack on the Japanese motherland, and such an attack was ruled out by Russia's isolation. Without superior naval forces, an invasion of Japan was impossible. The German Kaiser Wilhelm II, whose fleet was still small in 1904, was too pro-English and inclined to peace to consider for a moment military intervention on behalf of the Tsar, and Germany's allies, Austria-Hungary and Italy, had enough trouble of their own on their hands. The Habsburgs were beset by subversive Pan-Slav agitation in their own empire and in the Balkans, and when the Abyssinians defeated the regular Italian army at Adua in 1896, decadent crowds lined the streets of Rome shouting, "Long live Menelik! "

Japan had a completely free hand in its new war of aggression, so much so that it freely sacrificed almost 100,000 Japanese casualties in the storming of a Port Arthur that was about to be surrendered for lack of supplies - just to impress the military of the USA and Europe with Japanese fanaticism and bravery³⁵⁷. Togo could have taken Port Arthur in February 1904 with 10,000 men, but the Japanese strategy had decided to use the same method as the first conquest from the hands of the Chinese ten years earlier: to attack from the from the land side. Japanese propaganda - with strong British support - boasted effectively about "a small, chivalrous nation that had been forced into war." ³⁵⁸ The invasion without a declaration of war aroused "no remorse in Tokyo ... Japan absolved itself of any guilt" ³⁵⁹.

Japan's success becomes Teddy Roosevelt's nightmare

In 1904, when Japan incurred guilt, its invasion led to a successful war, but in 1941, when it took legitimate action against the USA, the subsequent war turned into the greatest catastrophe in Japan's 2,500-year history. No one ever doubted that Japan would have failed to succeed in its early aggressions against China (1894) and Germany (1914) had it not had the enthusiastic support of both England and the USA on its side.

Nevertheless, the promotion of early Japanese imperialism by Britain and the US was to arouse serious fears in the minds of two Anglo-American US presidents, Teddy Roosevelt and Woody Wilson. That the latter sought to appease Japan at the expense of China in 1919 was the single most significant factor leading to the US Senate's rejection of Wilson's beloved Treaty of Versailles, although neither Teddy nor Woody would ever have disputed London's right to direct US foreign policy. The nonsense of "Manifest Destiny", which was used throughout the 19th century to justify a predatory program of imperialism, militarism and aggression throughout the Western Hemisphere,

evolved from 1898 into the no less foolish notion, shared by Teddy and Woody, that the US was destined to one day dominate the world - a self-delusion still cherished today by TR's, WW's and FDR's epigones, including Jimmy Carter³⁶⁰. Carter, as a former US naval officer with ten years of active service, had the audacity to claim that the senseless and sadistic American atomic bombings of Japan in 1945 saved American lives - even though Capt. E. Zacharias of the US Navy had already definitively refuted this pathetic propaganda ploy thirty years earlier³⁶¹.

Anglomaniacs like Teddy, Woody, Frank and Jimmy assumed that Anglo-American cooperation would one day lead to a gracious transfer of global power from London to Washington, DC. This euphoric theory further assumed that no other nation, such as Russia, China, India, Germany or Japan, would ever be able to challenge this transfer of the British legacy of global power. The main reason for the rejoicing of official America in 1904 was thus the decline of its potential rival Russia, which US Secretary of State Seward had predicted would one day be met in Manchuria in a fight to the death³⁶².

However, the Japanese superiority over Russia in 1904 was so overwhelming from day one that Teddy Roosevelt did not yet begin to doubt London's wisdom, but he began to suspect that the USA and Great Britain might have been tricked by Japan rather than the other way round. In short, Japan's military heroism and success made Teddy fear that Japan might soon eclipse the USA in the Pacific. He would not have ordered Admiral Dewey to Manila in 1898 if he had not regarded the Pacific Ocean as an American sea of the senses. And England - despite the countless voluntary diplomatic services of the USA for London - would be anything but a help to the USA in the event of an American-Japanese war, because England was Japan's ally.

The Japanese nightmare tormented Teddy Roosevelt incessantly during the last fifteen years of his pathological existence (1904-1919). The spectre of Japanese efficiency and Japanese ambition upset the mentally unstable Woody Wilson countless times during the First World War. Frank Roosevelt was then the first of these Anglomaniac presidents to astutely recognize that Japan - a country the size of California and without significant natural resources - would be no match for a protracted war with the inherently wealthy United States. Finally, Frank Roosevelt succeeded in inducing the Japanese to attack the USA in 1941, so that America could now openly attack Hitler in Europe and give increased support to StaUn, the darling of world Jewry. This FORsche strategy, which ended with the devastation of a considerable part of the world in 1945, would not have been conceivable if FDR had feared Japan. At no point after his secret alliance with Stalin in 1933 did FDR advocate a lasting settlement with Japan.

Unlike Frank Roosevelt, however, Teddy feared Japan too much to go for a

confrontation, so he decided on a two-pronged policy. One of their most absurd pronouncements after the Russo-Japanese War was Teddy's provocative, costly and ridiculously transparent decision to have America's main fleet sail around the world, with a visit to Japan carefully planned in. Thus he tried to intimidate Japan with boastful displays of American power, and to appease Japan in every other respect, for example with the difficult domestic problems associated with the undesirable immigration of Japanese to the USA. In short, from 1904 onwards, Teddy failed completely in terms of US-Japan relations. His policy was adopted unquestioningly by his self-elected successor Bill Taft and also by Taft's successor Woody Wilson. It was only after the First World War was over that President Harding and Secretary of State Hughes decided to improve the situation by making the following offer: if Britain gave up its alliance with Japan, the US Navy would voluntarily remain smaller than the British fleet in the long term (but the public was misled with a non-existent agreement that allegedly provided for a 5:5:3 parity between Britain, the USA and Japan). This tactic, dubious as it was, was crowned with success at the Washington Naval Conference of 1921-1922. Of course, it was foolish to imagine that the existence or non-existence of this treaty would influence British strategy, and a few years later - still in the pre-Roosevelt era - official America was already fearful of a possible Anglo-Japanese surprise attack on the USA³⁶³. Thus Teddy Roosevelt's nightmare of 1904 remained the official nightmare of the USA for almost thirty years until FDR appeared and entered into the secret American-Soviet alliance in 1933³⁶⁴.

The Kaneko mission

The London "Times" was horrified by the Japanese retaliatory strike against Pearl Harbor in 1941, but had written quite differently about the Japanese surprise attack in 1904: "Our ally ... aroused the admiration of the world ... by acting thus before war had been declared ... is in supreme accord with the prevailing practice in most wars of modern times." ³⁶⁵

After Port Arthur, Japan's Minister President Ito sent Viscount Kaneko Kantaro - a fellow student of Teddy Roosevelt at Harvard - to the USA "to win America's sympathy" ³⁶⁶ Kaneko had not been happy at Harvard, did not like the USA and did not want to go there, but went when the Japanese Empress personally insisted. This was very similar to 1941, when Churchill sent Lord Halifax to the USA as British ambassador. Churchill knew that although Halifax considered war to be in the interests of British policy in Europe, he also admired Germany and its leaders Hitler, Göring and Goebbels³⁶⁷ - and also hated FDR in particular and the USA in general. However, like Kaneko in 1904, Halifax

bowed to the orders of his sovereign George VI, which Churchill had requested, and spent the most unhappy time of his life in America during the remaining years of the Second World War.

Kaneko left for the USA on February 24, 1904, at a time when Teddy was still genuinely enthusiastic about all things Japanese. Like Wilson, Teddy also had a soft spot for Jews, even if - in view of a broad anti-Jewish attitude in the USA due to the evil business practices of Jews - he kept a low public profile and would never have dreamed of making four Jews, House - Baruch - Brandeis - Morgenthau Sr. his main political advisors, as Wilson later did. Teddy had learned that in the winter of 1903-1904 in a remote corner of the Russian Empire, in Kishinev/Bessarabia, a group of Romanians had treated some Jews roughly. Teddy told his old Harvard friend Viscount Kaneko that he was shocked that such a thing could happen in a 20th century civilization, and he was pleased that Japan was now punishing the Christian Tsar of Russia³⁶⁸ Teddy told Kaneko that "he detested the Russian government "³⁶⁹ and exuberantly expressed his desire to be a soldier of Japan himself at this moment of outstanding Japanese glory. He persuaded Kaneko to find him a good teacher of bushido, jiu-jitsu and other Japanese Shinto samurai arts.

Teddy told Kaneko that he had been denouncing Russia for years because the czar refused to follow the American example and remove all legal barriers to Jews in public life and to their personal advancement. (The last civil rights restrictions for Jews in the USA had been lifted in New Hampshire in 1878). The Tsar refused to allow the Jewish element to rise to the highest heights it deserved to lead modern industrial society (and as was the case in the USA, England and Germany). Since it irritated Russia to be so fiercely hated by the distant US president, Teddy told the Japanese viscount, the tsar's foreign minister, Lamsdorf, had invented the story that his family was Jewish and their real Dutch name was Rosenfeld. Teddy told Kaneko that he didn't care, because it would make him just as proud and happy to be Japanese or Jewish³⁷⁰.

Pro-Japanese propaganda in America and England

Kaneko was overwhelmed by the favors and pro-Japanese sentiments Teddy showered on him (including advice to go on a speaking tour of the US and write a series of articles for the press). Teddy treated the Japanese with a distinction that guaranteed him the greatest possible success with the American media. For example, photographs appeared showing Teddy and Kaneko, the two old friends, walking around the White House grounds. One of the best and smartest tips Kaneko got from Teddy was to appeal to the Americans' notorious money-mindedness and claim that a Japanese victory over Russia would lead to

enormous new economic opportunities for the US in China.

Teddy's strategy was successful. As the American economy was not doing well at the time - the US foreign debt was rising and real wages were falling year on year - the haughty and aristocratic Viscount Kaneko was greeted as a hero and savior throughout the US and Japan was showered with voluntary gifts from America to support its war effort against Russia³⁷¹. Yet there was no real reason at all why American trade with China should increase as a result of a Japanese victory over Russia. In fact, the exact opposite was true because Japan soon began to push all foreign trade - except its own - out of Korea. Teddy was so accustomed to lying to the American public and breaking promises made to them³⁷² that he unhesitatingly supplied Kaneko with a stockpile of lies that ran counter to the real interests of the oppressed American masses.

The Foreign Office in London engaged the leading publicist Alfred Stead for pro-Japanese propaganda, and in 1904 he produced the most sophisticated and glamorous glorification of Japan and Japanese militarism ever published³⁷³. The London Morning Post proclaimed that Japan had "shaken off the chains of feudalism thirty-seven years ago and never looked back"³⁷⁴.

London correspondents in Tokyo asserted that Japan had "gone mad with joy" after the initial success of Port Arthur.³⁷⁵ Japan's most celebrated poet, Ischikawa Takuhoku, wrote a folk song "What Joy!" to mark the occasion. A cursory official declaration of war by Japan was not made until several days after the attack. In his brief and casual 500-word message, the Emperor tried to disguise the opportunity factor. In Tokyo, London and Washington/D. C., international law obviously meant nothing in the face of a military victory. When England or the USA morally castigated other countries in the subsequent 20th century and played the moral governors of the universe, it was just a joke. The hypocrisy and wickedness of the Anglo-American alliance in the 20th century is unique and can never be surpassed.

The siege of Port Arthur

The Japanese missed their initial chance to capture Port Arthur, and the Russian garrison under General Stössel worked hard to restore their fleet as far as was possible after the attack. An attempt to tow the battleship Retvisan from the silt bank where it had sunk failed. Two other large ships, the battleship Lenissei and the cruiser Bojarin, were sunk during a patrol shortly after the attack. When two Japanese merchant ships that refused to stop were sunk by the Russian cruiser squadron from Vladivostok, the Japanese press was

hypocritically shocked by the allegedly uncivilized warfare of the Russians³⁷⁷.

The Japanese shelled Port Arthur from land and sea throughout March 1904. They caused the Russians to dismiss all Chinese laborers working on the fortifications and repairing the shelling damage by publicly announcing that they would kill any Chinese civilians found there on the spot after capturing the base³⁷⁸.

Twenty-nine-year-old Alex Kolchak-who later led the heroic Christian defense of Siberia against the Bolsheviks during the Russian Civil War of 1917-1920, until he was betrayed by the Anglo-Americans and tortured and murdered by the Reds-this Kolchak commanded a destroyer against the Japanese at Port Arthur and received every Russian decoration for bravery there was. During a heavy bombardment on March 23, 1904, the entire Russian squadron set out on an unsuccessful attempt under the most difficult circumstances to break Togo's stranglehold on the Russian base³⁷⁹. Admiral Makaroff, the Russian naval commander at Port Arthur, was killed in a second unsuccessful counterattack against the Japanese on April 12, when his flagship Petropavlovsk was sunk³⁸⁰.

The Russians had a single submarine at Port Arthur. One of their biggest concerns was the Japanese submarine fleet, which had been built in Quincy, Massachusetts, and shipped in numbered parts via Seattle, Washington, to Yokohama after the outbreak of war in 1904. Other Japanese submarines were built in Kobel, Japan, under the direction of American naval architects. (The first American submarine to be deployed - a primitive one - was used in the 18th century during the War of Independence against the British on the Hudson River). Later, when the Russian Baltic Fleet was on its way to the Far East, a few English fishing cutters in the dense fog of Dogger Bank were naturally mistaken for Japanese submarines - whereupon the British bombastically threatened that they would use this insignificant incident as an opportunity to destroy the Russian Baltic Fleet.

The undermining of tsarist rule

Massive English-Jewish-Japanese agitation after the outbreak of war literally tore Russia apart. Nicholas II and Tsarina Alix had always revered Tolstoy (1826-1910) and were now saddened to see how he naively allowed himself to be used by the subversive forces to destroy Russia. Anyone familiar with Tolstoy's socio-economic and political writings knew that he was a Christian-anarchist disciple of Prince Kropotkin (1842-1921). Like Kropotkin himself, who returned to Russia from voluntary exile in 1917, Tolstoy would have been appalled by the tyranny of Jewish Bolshevism, which had destroyed Russia with British help in 1917. The Jewish Kramola, directed from B'nai B'rith

headquarters in New York City, had plagued Russia for twenty-five years with ceaseless waves of murder and sabotage, and Nicholas, like Louis XVI of France before him, knew that worldwide Illuminati forces were on the march to destroy his country and seize it as their base for achieving world domination. They had chosen Russia and abandoned France after their orgy of terror during the Paris Commune of 1871 had failed. The Tsar knew that the Japanese surprise attack was not an isolated local event, but part of an international conspiracy to destroy Russia and permanently enslave its population. No wonder that in 1914, despite British pressure, Nicholas II refused for 24 hours to sign the General Mobilization Order, the order which the British ambassador Buchanan had demanded and which Britain needed to start the First World War³⁸.

Japan's rioting against Russia

Colonel Akashi Motojiri visited anti-tsarist revolutionary exile groups in Vienna and Berlin shortly before the Japanese attack. He also met in Sweden with Konni Zilliacus, a Finnish lawyer who promised to lead an open revolutionary struggle against Russia after the outbreak of war³⁸. Zilliacus, born in Finland in 1855, had managed a railroad workers' camp in Costa Rica and worked as a journalist in Chicago before returning to Finland in 1898 and founding a revolutionary newspaper there. His newspaper was banned in 1900 and he fled to Stockholm, where Akashi, who was well supplied with material by the British Secret Service, soon made contact with him. Zilliacus received Japanese money in Stockholm and published the magazine *Fria Ord* (Free Word) in Swedish. A third of the population in Finland were Swedish Finns, whose emigration from Sweden to Finland had begun in the 12th century, and educated Finns read Swedish, Russian and German as well as Finnish. Zilliacus' extremely inflammatory paper was delivered all over Finland with the help of a 65-foot yacht provided by England. It was no secret that Zilliacus wanted an armed uprising against Russia, as he had openly advocated it at a Finnish emigrants' congress in Stockholm in 1903. As soon as the war broke out, all the Finnish rebels were observed in Stockholm going to the Japanese legation to get their instructions³⁸.

Akashi worked no less successfully in Poland with Josef Pil-sudski and the PPS, the Polish Marxist party that advocated self-determination and independence for the four-fifths of Poland that were in Russian hands. They initially kept their intentions towards Germany and Austria-Hungary secret until the Russians were expelled from Poland in 1915 - then they directed their full offensive power against Berlin and Vienna. Akashi had no difficulty in convincing Pilsudski - who visited Tokyo at Japan's expense after the outbreak

of war - that the war in the Far East would weaken Russia's authority everywhere and that "Poland would benefit from a Japanese victory"38\

Dr. Witold Jadko, who had been a Polish-Galician deputy in the Austrian Imperial Council, knew that England was behind the Japanese digging against Russia and hurried from Vienna to London and proposed the recruitment of a Polish volunteer force in exile to fight for Japan everywhere at Tokyo's discretion. Another of his suggestions met with the approval of the British: propaganda among Polish conscripts on the Russian Manchurian front would encourage the desertion of Poles and Russians and thus contribute to the Japanese victory. Roman Dmowski, the most important Polish political philosopher between the uprising against Russia in 1863 and the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939, rushed to Japan and implored the Japanese not to use romantic Polish muddleheads to distract Russia militarily in the West. Dmowski argued that, just as in 1863, much Polish blood would again be shed in a cause that was rather detrimental to Polish interests, and that no real advantage would accrue to the Japanese. But Dmowski's plea fell on deaf ears, because the Japanese shared the xenophobic chauvinism of the islanders with the English. Polish blood meant nothing to them and, like the English, they were willing to accept huge Polish losses for a modest Japanese advantage. Through Hayashi in London, Tokyo provided Pilsudski with all the support he needed to buy weapons to arm Polish volunteers386.

Then suddenly everything changed: Downing Street ordered Tokyo to drop the project of a Polish army in exile. The reason for this can easily be found in the Anglo-French Entente Cordiale concluded in April 1904, according to which the French and English military leaders, together with the Belgian military chiefs, began to work on future plans against Germany. The French entrusted the English with all the details of the secret Franco-Russian alliance of 1894, which stipulated that in the event of action against Germany, the main Russian concentration should not be against Austria-Hungary, but against Germany on the common Russian-German border. Overthrowing the Tsardom on behalf of world Jewry was a fine thing, but if an independent Polish state were to emerge, this could hinder the future advance of the Russian army to take Berlin - so the French persuaded the English that the Polish question should only be taken up once Germany had been destroyed. Finally, further Polish uprisings and sabotage against the Tsardom within the Russian Empire were encouraged, but the idea of a Polish volunteer army was dropped - to the dismay of Pilsudski, who now switched gears completely for ten years and - this time successfully - mobilized German and Austrian support for the concept of a separate Polish force in the event of a war between the Central Powers and Russia. This course led directly to the re-establishment of Polish independence with German help in November 1916388^

The Russian defeat in Korea

It seemed clear to the Tsar's Minister of War, Kuropatkin, from the outset that the war against Japan would be decided on the plains of Manchuria and not at sea or in Port Arthur. When Kuropatkin arrived with his headquarters in his private train in Liaojiang on March 28, 1904. March 1904 in Liaojiang, Manchuria, he was shocked to realize how weak the Russian defenders were, how weak the Russian defenders were both in southern Manchuria and on the Yalu border against Korea³⁸⁹. He ordered the attack by Cossack cavalry on Japanese troop concentrations between Pyongyang (which was to become the capital of communist North Korea after 1945) and Yalu as part of a^{ve} delaying strategy until the hoped-for arrival of the Japanese troops. strategy until the hoped-for arrival of significant Russian reinforcements in late spring 1904³⁹⁰. These Cossack attacks were called off in April 1904, as Japanese strength had grown too much throughout Korea. The Russians were stunned by the power of the Japanese artillery, especially their new Krupp howitzers. The Japanese advanced across the Yalu at the end of April and won a great victory. The highlight was the surrender of the Russian Imperial Guard Regiment No. 4391.

The world took note. "It was 5:30 p.m. on Sunday, May 1, 1904, and the world was no longer the same."³⁹² Historically, there is a straight line between the Russian defeat at Yalu in 1904 at the hands of Japan and the American defeat at Yalu in 1950 at the hands of Red China. It was not the struggle for supremacy between Russia and the USA in Manchuria prophesied by Seward - on the soil of a prostrate Asia - but rather these two were defeated on this very soil in separate conflicts by Asian nations. And just as the Yalu defeat of the Russians hastened the fall of Tsardom, it hastened the fall of American imperialism. Now the Far East will never again lie prostrate, crushed to the ground by the blows of American and British imperialism, as was the case in those years after the United States forced its way into Japan in 1853 and the British ravaged and plundered Peking in 1860. The wheel of Asian destiny had turned a great deal since the days of William Henry Seward. As far as England was concerned, its defeat of Singapore in 1942 - a century after its victorious conclusion of the First Opium War against China - was also a harbinger, and after 1945 it became apparent to everyone that the age of worldwide British imperialism had come to an end. Porter Sargent of Harvard, who had lived and worked within the British Empire for ten years before the Second World War and knew most of the prominent figures of both England and the USA, observed around the middle of the 20th century that the Anglo-Americans had held the world in their hollow hands at the beginning of the century, but had made something terrible of it in record time. The Anglo-Americans learned nothing from all these experiences: The English ruling class and the official Anglomaniacs of the United States

continued to cling to an obsolete and useless messianic mythology, but their increasing weakness could be counted on to put an end to their worldwide devastation and reveal the folly of their dreams³³³

After its victory at Yalu in 1904, Japan could get as much as it wanted in loans from London and New York City, and the Japanese were considered destined to play a major role in Manchuria and Korea "for the next forty years"³⁹⁴. Japan also cut off Port Arthur's last land connections in May 1904, and what remained of the possibilities for the deployment of Russian warships there collapsed completely after Admiral Makaroff's death in battle. Since the Russians could no longer obtain any supplies by land or sea, Port Arthur had to fall to the Japanese like ripe fruit³⁹⁵. The defenders of Port Arthur were to experience only one more satisfaction: when Kolchak and his comrades secretly laid mines in the path of the Japanese battleships in an arrogant show of force.

The battleships Hatsuse and Jashima sank, hit by Russian mines - the latter so quickly that half of its crew drowned, even though the Japanese fleet was present³⁹⁶. The Japanese public was not allowed to know that Togo had lost a third of its expensive battleships in a single day, and the English and American press claimed that the Russians had used cowardly tactics to achieve a success against Japan³⁹⁷.

The case of Port Arthur

Port Arthur was not seriously attacked on land until May 1904. As a minor nuisance, only Chinese bandits had been hired to destroy the Russian supplies in the area of the base. But the Japanese surprised the observers on May 25 with a powerful advance on land against Port Arthur, which they had easily wrested from its Chinese defenders ten years earlier³⁹⁸. Russia lost 1000 men in this first battle, Japan 6000, and the Japanese troops had fired more ammunition than in the entire Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895³⁹⁹.

General Kodama, the Japanese army commander-in-chief, had never wanted this senseless offensive against an object whose fate was sealed even without Japanese action. ⁴However, his subordinate, General Nogi, who then carried out the attack on Port Arthur, had convinced the Emperor and the Genro (the Council of Elders) that the operation would have a favorable effect on Japanese moral as well as world opinion, even if it involved a senseless division of Japanese forces, which were to concentrate their efforts on exploiting their initial success in Manchuria. Nogi, who had been trained in Germany in the 1880s, had reported to Tokyo at the time that the German army was "TOO frivolous" - but nothing could be more frivolous (given the dubious nature of this prejudiced statement) than the operation he himself carried out against Port

Arthur in 1904. It left its mark on the Japanese military spirit forever, for "Nogi was a fanatic ... the soldiers ... were whipped up to the same degree of fanaticism"400.

Nogi lost his own son in this first battle and wrote a poem in classical Chinese to commemorate the event401. Nogi achieved his personal goal, together with Togo, of becoming one of the two greatest Japanese heroes of this war; but as in the case of Hindenburg in Germany, who was later credited with the victory at Tannenberg, this was more a success of censorship and excellent public relations. As the Russian defenders fought bravely and inflicted heavy losses on the fanatically attacking Japanese, Nicholas II and his Admiralty courageously decided in June 1904 to send the outdated Russian Baltic Fleet to relieve Port Arthur - after Kuropat-kin had assured them that a relief from Manchuria was impossible. When Togo heard this news, he ordered a large quantity of the most modern sea mines in London4 02^

The Japanese offensive to conquer Manchuria began on June 14, 1904. Five days later, a large demonstration by Polish Marxists against the tsar was staged in Warsaw, and in Finland, the governor general, General Bobrikov, was shot by a Finnish terrorist. Interior Minister Plehwe, who was soon to be murdered himself, then sent 110 wealthy Jewish St. Petersburg doctors to the Far East to fight in the war403.

While Kodama carried out his offensive against the main Russian base at Liaojiang, Manchuria, Nogi accelerated his suicidal attacks against Port Arthur404. In retaliation for the daily shelling of Port Arthur that accompanied the land attacks, Kolchak and his comrades made a surprise destroyer attack on Togo. They hit the Mikisa, Togo's flagship, heavily and inflicted considerable damage on the battleships Asahi and Schikischima405. Several Russian ships broke through Togo's cordon and steamed towards either the French base at Saigon or the Russian Vladivostok. None of the ships reached Vladivostok, only some of the surviving crew members made it after the ships were sunk. The Vladivostok squadron went to sea to support the breakthrough, but nothing came of it except the loss of the Rurik, the best of the Russian ships406.

On August 19, 1904, Nogi launched the largest attack on Port Arthur to date. Rumors circulated in Tokyo that the Russian base would be stormed by the end of the month407. The Japanese lost 18,000 men without forcing a breakthrough. By the day of the conquest, January2. January 2, 1905, Nogi's losses amounted to 91549 men - a number far greater than the number of Russians who had ever fought at Port Arthur. Nicholas spoke for Russians and Japanese alike when he declared at home in the midst of the revolutionary turmoil: "They are all heroes ... It must have been God's will."408

The naval battle of Tsushima

The diversion of Japanese land forces to Port Arthur had weakened the Japanese offensive to drive the Russians out of all of Manchuria. Under these circumstances, the Japanese were fortunate to have the help of Yuan Shi-k'ai and the China of Ching: "His help further north in Manchuria made the Russian rearward connections increasingly insecure and often dangerous "409. China helped Japan in many ways, for example with 200,000 sets of winter clothing from northern Chinese factories for Japanese soldiers during the Manchurian Winter Campaign 1904-1905410. Nogi was given supreme command of operations in Manchuria in mid-January 1905 and immediately began an advance on the large city of Mukden, where a major battle raged from February 27 to March 9. Each side lost almost 90,000 men, the Russians a third of them prisoners4u.

Shortly after Nogi's loss-making victory at Mukden, the Russian Baltic Fleet passed Singapore on its way to Japan. Togo had meanwhile completed the destruction of the Russian Port Arthur and Wladiwost oker squadrons. The Baltic Fleet was steaming through the Tsushima Strait on the morning of^e s May 27, heading for Vladivostok, when it saw^T ogo's attack fleet appearing in the fog412. During this^w old battle, "the Russian crews, most of whom had never been in combat before, stared mesmerized by the smoke and flames"⁴ ^ Togo's flagship took twelve hits and Pakenham, the British advisor, had to change his uniform, when his first was wet with Japanese blood414 Admiral Roschdestwenski, who had soon been slightly wounded, received a second, serious wound - with a shell splinter penetrating his head - when the battle was still undecided⁴ ^ At about the same time, Yamamoto, who was to lead the strike against Pearl Harbor in 1941, lost two fingers. Fighting between the smaller ships continued throughout the following night, and when the entire Japanese fleet attacked again at 5:00 a.m., the shattered Russian fleet, still 300 miles from Vladivostok, no longer had the will to fight on. Admiral Nevogatov had taken command and tried in vain to collect the remnants of the fleet before raising the white flag on the Nikolai I at 11.15 a.m. - which was immediately copied on the other Russian ships. With Pakenham's approval, Togo continued the destructive fire on the surrendering ships. Akijama, an adjutant, was surprised by this, but Togo coolly replied that he would let them all continue firing until they stopped their engines⁴ ^ Togo and Pakenham had acted in the same way when the large Chinese freighter Kowshing was sunk at the beginning of the Sino-Japanese War in 1894. The few remaining Russian wrecks were eventually towed to the Japanese naval base at Sasebo. The Russians lost 13,500 men in this Japanese victory, the Japanese 700,417.

Despite their naval victory at Tsushima, the Japanese had suffered heavy losses on land thanks to Nogi's strategy at Port Arthur and Mukden; their American friend Teddy Roosevelt was secretly worried about Japan's future power and lured the Japanese with false promises that they could reap all the rewards of victory without^c further fighting if they themselves accepted him as a peace broker. Neither Tsar Nicholas II nor Kaiser Wilhelm II^c believed in a Russian victory after the destruction of the Baltic Fleet, and the Kaiser advised the Tsar to negotiate peace⁴¹⁸. In the end, London and Berlin supported the American mediation offer, and Russia and Japan agreed to peace negotiations in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. Foreign Minister Komura - the first Japanese Harvard graduate - led the Japanese delegation, Sergei Witte the Russian⁴¹⁹.

Although the British secretly agreed with Teddy that excessive Japanese territorial and financial demands should be trimmed, they left this work to the USA alone. It was a reprise of the Berlin Congress of 1878, only this time it was not Germany but the USA that had to pull the British chestnuts out of the fire and fulfill all British wishes. American public opinion had taken a sharp turn since Togo had slaughtered the Russian fleet at Tsushima, and Witte had succeeded in his intention to "convince the world that Japan was fighting for material gain"⁴²⁰. US public opinion turned against Japan - just as it would turn against France thirteen years later, after the 1918 armistice⁴²¹.

In addition to a sphere of influence in Manchuria as large as Russia's and a monopoly over Korea (except for the British trading concessions there), Japan demanded Port Arthur, the entire Russian island of Sakhalin, and an enormous indemnity. The Japanese were stunned when Witte calmly told them across the negotiating table that the Tsar and the Russian General Staff would continue the war on Sakhalin indefinitely - under no circumstances would Russia cede the entire island to Japan. Finally, on August 29, 1905, Sakhalin was divided along the 50th parallel, and Russia, with Teddy's firm support, refused to pay any compensation. The Japanese had successfully landed on Sakhalin in July 1905, but in the negotiations Witte won back half of what Russia had lost in the war. This inspired a French reporter present to exclaim: "Vive la Russie."⁴²² It was like a repeat of the peace of Shimonoseki, except that in 1905 Japan blamed the USA, not France, Germany or Russia. England escaped criticism both times and remained in Japan's favor. The *War* ers noted in their book that Teddy's superfluous and foolish p^o licy earned the US "the bitter enmity of Japan"⁴²³. "Teddy had allowed himself to be led where England wanted him to go and had reacted to every new situation with immature emotionality instead of intelligence. Although neither Teddy nor the USA learned from this bitter experience, it was the beginning of an everlasting personal nightmare for Teddy

Roosevelt that would only end with his death in 1919.

Spencer and Mahan had convinced Teddy that in all matters of world politics England had to be the model, and during all these years Woody Wilson, Bill Taft and Frank Roosevelt held the same view. The heroic stance of encircled Germany caused Teddy to abandon his Anglophilia for a few weeks in August 1914 and to declare publicly that Germany's march through Belgium was a strategic necessity⁴²⁴, but his ties in the East Coast plutocracy proved stronger, and by November 1914 Teddy was back where he had always been: in the Anglomaniac fold. He would never have been capable of the kind of prolonged removal from the English fold that Frank Roosevelt indulged in after Ivy Lee had successfully promoted American-Soviet cooperation on behalf of Rockefeller and Rothschild - leading to the 1933 Litvinov-Finkelstein mission to the US and FDR's secret alliance with Stalin of that year, as well as FDR's policy of exploiting the emergency of World War II to dissolve the British Empire. It was quite clear to Elliott Roosevelt in Casablanca in 1943 that his father had no respect for Winston Churchill or Charles de Gaulle and believed that the destruction of the British and French colonial empires was necessary for the coming post-war cooperation between the USA and the USSR⁴²⁵. In this way, British policy since 1896 - the policy of constant manipulation of the USA in the interests of British imperialist projects - led within two short generations not only to the destruction of Europe but to the irrevocable demise of the British Empire.

Fifth chapter

WILSON'S PRESIDENCY

The USA on the eve of the First World War

The tragic and blind allegiance to England characterized Woodrow Wilson throughout his life^ The world would have had it better and easier if Americans like the Republican Bob LaFollette or the Democrat Champ Clark had reached the presidency and put an end to the revived tradition of American Anglomania before the outbreak of the First World War. In fact, it is conceivable that Sir Edward Grey would not have unleashed the First World War had England not been able to count on an Anglophile US presidency.

The official American policy of blindly following England included the destruction of the modern world. It is a tragedy that the US could not have a presidential leader who was independent in his foreign policy, such as William J. Bryan, who was defeated three times in his own presidential bids and then duped by the deceptions of Edward Mandeli House into supporting Wilson's nomination in 1912 - and who was then ruthlessly hounded out of office as Secretary of State in 1915 for advocating a free and fair US foreign policy. Wilson excused and justified every British atrocity in the Fourth Anglo-Burian War of 1899-1902, whereas Earl Warren, later Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, remembered from his childhood Bryan's public^e hes, solemn prayer in those days: "God grant that Eng^{la} nd never wins!"²

In addition to this mortal sin of supporting any and all British crimes against the^e people, however, there was an odor of hypocrisy that clung to^{der} U.S. foreign policy, which was a source of concern to Europeans and other foreign countries.

countries was intolerable: While the other superpowers were openly pursuing "world politics," "official America seemed to think that power was immoral. "3^ But at the same time as all this hypocrisy about the immorality of power,

Teddy Roosevelt and Bill Taft were espousing an unscrupulous belief in dollar diplomacy,⁴ complete with U.S. naval invasions of Latin America - at a time when the United States, though decidedly a debtor country in the international money market, had "become the leading nation on earth in the economic field."⁵

What America owes to the Europeans

The USA owed its leading economic position to a number of factors. First of all, there was Western European investment, which was greater in the USA than in Russia. The USA also had better natural transportation facilities than ice-blocked Russia - not least of which were a vast ice-free coastline and a river system more conducive to business. The US also had a reservoir of cheap labor - thanks to the cruel oppression of domestic plutocratic evildoers and the natural influx of people from Europe, where population density was much greater. America also had vast supplies of all the major natural inputs for industry such as iron, coal, copper, petroleum and timber. There was a huge internal market with no tariff barriers, and only 5 percent of the gross national product came from foreign trade. There was no need for a large and costly US standing army, as the country - unlike the European powers and Japan - had no problems from powerful neighbors. This economic leadership of the USA, as Duroselle (a brilliant French diplomatic historian and worthy successor to the great Pierre Re-Nouvin) has correctly analyzed, was not the result of any particular American virtue or achievement.

Contrary to the chauvinistic mythology of American public schools, the Americans had been relatively less inventive in the modern industrialization of the West than the Germans, French, Scots and English. The economic leadership of the United States was due solely to a combination of fortunate circumstances and European assistance. Without French military support, American independence from England would have been impossible to achieve. Without Anglo-French aid during the American Civil War-in the form of huge shipments of war materiel-the plutocratic evildoers of the Northeast could never have overpowered the South, which had 90 percent of the military talent on its side. Without the enormous investments from northwestern Europe, the transcontinental railroads and the oil and steel industries could not have been built until much later. The so-called Old Immigration of 1607-1880 from northwestern Europe (England, Germany, Scotland, Wales, Ireland, Holland, Norway and Sweden) was indispensable for the development of the modern USA.

The so-called New Immigration from B Europe after 1880 (Jews, Poles,

Czechs, Southern Italians) cannot easily be counted among the European contributions to the rise of the United States, even though it added to the already vast available pool of cheap labor, because it brought with it so much crime, corruption and ethnic discord that it was more of a liability than an asset in socio-economic terms. This was unquestionably true of its main component, the influx of Jews, whose hatred of Christianity, Christian ethics and traditional ideas of Christian law prompted their presumptuous and successful attempt to seize financial control of the entire United States and corrupt it by monopolizing the public media, dominating American governance and waging a successful campaign to disorient and disrupt traditional Christianity.

The Jews' final political and financial goals were achieved in 1913 with the inauguration of Woody Wilson and the Federal Reserve Bank (Bundesbank) legislation that immediately followed, which gave world Jewry control of America's currency forever. Even such a powerful American industrial pioneer as Henry Ford Sr. was quickly and effectively silenced by the Jews when he tried to warn Americans of Jewish power after World War I. And as a result of deliberate disinformation by the Jewish-controlled media (instead of education and enlightenment), the American public has remained the most ignorant and ill-informed mass of the entire West in the 20th century - a fact that was to have dire consequences for the entire world.

Bryan's illusions about Wilson

Duroselle was right in pointing out that William J. Bryan strongly opposed Teddy Roosevelt's expansionist, imperialist and Anglomanic policies of 1900-19096, but this opposition was ultimately unsuccessful. Teddy had a free hand in selecting Bill Taft to continue this policy, which Bill did - no matter how much Teddy criticized him domestically - with relish until March 1913, when Woody Wilson succeeded him in office. Bryan had been misled by Texas Jew Edward Mandell House into believing that Wilson shared his own anti-imperialist convictions. Otherwise, Bryan would never have been available to serve as Wilson's Secretary of State during the first two years of his presidency. It wasn't until 1915 that Bryan woke up to the fact that Wilson was a worse imperialist than John Hay, Teddy Roosevelt and Bill Taft. To ensure Wilson's narrow victory in the 1916 presidential election, Wilson and House - with the help of Martin Glynn of New York, who delivered the programmatic speech at the 1916 Democratic convention in St. Louis - managed to fool Bryan once again with a pretended change of heart by Wilson, away from Anglo-American imperialism and toward genuine neutrality. But as soon as Wilson was inaugurated for his second term in March 1917, he immediately dropped his deceitful peace pose and, with Bernard Baruch's help and by unlawful means, plunged the USA into the First World War'.

Duroselle notes that Wilson got his reward two years later when he went insane and the U.S. Senate rejected the illusory Versailles Treaty that Wilson had hatched with David Lloyd George and Georges Clemenceau. This victory of reason and common sense over the insane Wilson was nailed in the 1920 presidential election-the only one in the 20th century in which the American plutocratic miscreants failed to prevent the American people from expressing their foreign policy views. Wilson's global follies were discarded in favor of a "concept of nationalism" ⁸.

From Wilson to Roosevelt

The eventual triumph of Frank Roosevelt is Duroselle's main interest in his work on US foreign policy during the era of Wilson-Roosevelt madness, 1913-1945. Although American voters in 1920 had effectively given Harding, Coolidge and Hoover a twelve-year mandate until FDR took office to eliminate the pernicious Wilsonian high-handedness in foreign policy, the power of the American Jewish oligarchy was so great - and these three presidents so weak - that many remnants of the Wilson era remained intact beneath the surface, including a questionable secret collaboration sub rosa of the US with the decrepit Geneva League of Nations. The League of Nations achieved nothing at all in terms of disarmament and condoned every international crime, such as the 1923 Lithuanian occupation of the German Memelland - a territory that the League of Nations was explicitly obliged to defend against external encroachment. In 1920, the US Senate had decreed that official America should have nothing to do with Geneva. Duroselle posed the following question: in early 1937, 80 percent of the United States in a public poll thought that the U.S. entry into World War I was a stupidity that should never be repeated; how was it possible that fifty months after his warmongering Chicago Bridge speech of October 1937, Frank Roosevelt could trump all his international crimes and entice the disappointed Japanese to strike Pearl Harbor? Duroselle put it aptly: The "Americans sent themselves into it without enthusiasm" ⁹.

Duroselle tactfully remarks that, with regard to American foreign policy, he "avoided the procedure used in the textbooks of Samuel Flagg Bemis¹⁰, Thomas A. Bailey, Julius W. Pratt and Robert H. Ferrell" ¹¹. In other words, this most brilliant of FDR's biographers¹² was unwilling to base his own work on the half-truths and lies of the American court historians, even though he had spent a long time at Harvard for research purposes and had been exposed to the usual propaganda and pressure there. Duroselle had demonstrated in his biography of FDR that the supposed great leader of the world had been a helpless mama's boy until his mother's death in 1941-three and a half years before his own-and that he had been too ill most of the time after her death to

know what he was doing.

Duroselle wanted "to work out the motives behind the events rather than the details of the plot"^{Ua} . One thinks of Ostrogorski's seventy-year-old thesis about Americans having no more say in the selection of their presidents than Europeans had in the birth of their sovereigns^ It remains indisputable that two pathological leaders, Woodrow Wilson and Frank Roosevelt, did more than any other individuals to shape the world of the 20th century. They gave Bernard Baruch and Henry Morgenthau Jr. the supreme power that they themselves had not dreamed of.

Duroselle followed Pierre Renouvin's "distinction between the role of the statesman and the role of deep-seated impersonal forces" ¹⁴ He lamented the fact that after the dismaying incompetence and hypocrisy of the Inquiry (the official American peace negotiating team in Paris in 1919, including its so-called historical experts) "French historians practically turned their backs on the United States after the First World War"^ Certainly they could not be blamed for this in the face of American incompetence in the international arena, but as Georges Bonnet, the old French diplomat and statesman, discovered during his brief stay in the US as French ambassador in the 1930s, the presence of a madman like Roosevelt at the head of a Jewish-ridden, technologically powerful nation of mindless robots, like the US, was a fact that held more horror for Europe than for the US itself. Bonnet found that he could not make an inch of headway with Roosevelt when he tried to talk to him about the desirability of maintaining peace in Europe. Roosevelt paid no attention to any of his words and repeatedly clenched his fists like a boxer while insisting that Germany once again needed a taste of military might

Duroselle was both a popular teacher and an outstanding research scholar. He was able to make a success of his lecture on American foreign policy at the Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris during the ten years before the publication of his combined study of Wilson and Roosevelt, but in general the United States was a country that most educated Frenchmen preferred to forget, just as one likes to forget the plague, cancer and the Jewish atomic bomb that have plagued the world since 1945^

America 1913:

a giant, ready for aggression and expansion

Duroselle notes that in 1913, when Wilson succeeded Taft, a yearning for new wars and new international bloodshed was widespread in the upper circles of the USA. The old "Manifest Destiny" goal of "ocean to ocean" had been achieved in 1848, and the rapacious New England Yankees, so fond of plundering China and Africa and Latin America, had by 1865 turned the

American South into a subjugated province ripe for economic exploitation. In connection with the building of the White Squadron and the senseless rivalry with Germany over Samoa, there was an outburst of desire for American global aggression and imperialist expansion. Duroselle aptly describes it as a "revitalized ambition"¹⁹ Expansive new territories were acquired by the United States in rapid succession during the 1890s: the Kingdom of Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, Guam, Wake and Cuba. The de facto protectorate over Cuba became a de jure one in 1901, which was to last for more than thirty years, and even after that the USA retained a military base in Guantanamo/Cuba - despite the success of the US State Department in the 1950s in overthrowing the legal Batista government and bringing a communist regime under Fidel Castro to power (Castro, who had only become a communist because American officials encouraged him to do so in 1945).

Teddy Roosevelt invaded Colombia in 1903 and formed the new puppet state of the USA, Panama, exclusively from Colombian territory. He also occupied the whole of Santo Domingo in 1905 and created another US protectorate²⁰ In short, it was clear to the whole world that the years from 1898 to 1905 represented a new "epoch of American imperialism" ²⁰ . The USA, however, was far from satisfied with this huge territorial gain, which had been easy to come by, and was thirsting for new conquests and new glories.

The imperialist spirit of Alfred Mahan

In all this American drivel about imperialism, Duroselle discovered the guiding evil spirit of Captain Alfred Mahan, whom the French historian calls by his true name: a successful chauvinist-militarist geopolitician who left his mark on an entire era - the era up to 1945, which Duroselle calls the "Mahan era" ²² . To show that this is no exaggeration, Duroselle demonstrates that geopoliticians who advocated dominance on land, such as Mackinder in Scotland, Kjellen in Sweden and Haushofer in Germany, were minor figures in terms of their influence, although each of the three was far more intelligent than Mahan - for it was Mahan who left his mark on the fate and face of the world in those crucial two generations from 1895 to 1945²³.

Duroselle reminds us that England's world domination "was at its height in the Victorian era" ²⁴ because England was "the master of the seas". Mahan wanted a fighting US navy that would force reluctant nations to buy American goods - in exactly the same way that England had forced the infamous import of opium into China in violation of Chinese law. Mahan wanted a colossal US merchant marine, and he wanted the US to acquire colonies and bases anywhere on the globe under any pretext imaginable. In short, he wished for the terrible situation of an omnipresent United States that was actually created by Frank

Roosevelt and his successors, beginning with FDR's call in Chicago on October 5, 1937, for an American world conquest in collaboration with the Soviet Union²⁵

It was totally unnecessary for the inhuman Allied prosecutors in Nuremberg to produce the Roßbach Protocol of 5. 11. 1937 (whose authenticity Friedrich Roßbach himself refused to confirm) to convict and hang innocent German leaders on false charges, when the true world conqueror, Frank Roosevelt, had a month earlier proclaimed an American program for world conquest that would have made a Genghis Khan blush with shame - and this in public in Chicago, the stronghold of American anti-interventionism in those days. No wonder FDR complained to his Jewish cronies afterwards that no one wanted to follow his lead, but he did not give up on his project; on the contrary, he redoubled his efforts. His ambition to become the number one war criminal in world history was crowned with success fifty months later at Pearl Harbor.

Duroselle emphasized the fact that the main point of Mahan's militaristic agitation during the 1890s in the United States concerned what Mahan called the "maritime laziness" of the Americans. England's policy of forcing China to consume opium in defiance of its own laws would not have yielded this maximum profit if the British merchant marine had been too small and England's huge imports from China had to be transported in foreign ships. Mahan envisioned worldwide American expansion and forced trade everywhere - an idea that inspired Teddy and Frank Roosevelt - and no doubt such a program required a colossal American merchant marine²⁶.

Duroselle discovered that Mahan was using outrageous methods while lobbying for an American naval superpower²⁷. Although an uncompromising Anglophile, Mahan argued very sincerely in his agitation that "selfish national interest" was the only legitimate basis for American foreign policy. Teddy never fully grasped this point, which is why he did a lot of dirty work for England during the Russo-Japanese War and unnecessarily made an enemy of Japan. That Frank Roosevelt was different in this respect is shown by the report of one of his Communist friends²⁸, confirmed by Eleanor Roosevelt, who was present. The British dictator Winston Churchill had rushed to his masters in the USA after the Japanese strike on Pearl Harbor. At a banquet, FDR mentioned to Churchill that he had seen Queen Victoria in London in his youth. When Churchill seemed interested, FDR casually remarked that he had hated the old woman. There was a time when Churchill would not have swallowed such things, but after Pearl Harbor he put up with every possible insult from FDR and Stalin. That was the price Churchill had to pay for being allowed to hitch the British Empire's wagon to the American stars and stripes.

The Anglo-Saxon racial delusion

Mahan hated the claim by President Cleveland - who was reluctant to annex Hawaii - that the United States was already big enough. Mahan shared with Andrew Carnegie a fondness for Spencer and Darwin and was captivated by their absurd theory that any nation, to remain healthy, required "perpetual growth"[^] His innermost thoughts were close to Lord Salisbury's, who claimed that England's victory without outside interference in the unpopular Boer War of 1899-1902 had retrospectively justified the traditional British splendid isolation of the 19th century, and furthermore proved that England in the 20th century had been a "great nation". It also proved that Britain could prosper in the 20th century without allies. This claim was never refuted, for after Salisbury's successors abandoned his policy, the British Empire went down the drain within two generations, wherever it belonged. Mahan wanted the USA to enter into temporary alliances with "inferior races", but he rejected all emotional ties in the long term^{30^}

One might think Mahan's extremist ideas were unusual, but this was not at all the case in the US of the 1890s, on the eve of global American military aggression in the 20th century in the name of the mythical illusion of so-called Anglo-Saxon racial superiority - as the seminal work of Jewish scholar Allan Chase^{3^} demonstrates. Its Jewish author, whose first book was an absurd piece of World War II war propaganda³², seethes with subjective Jewish master-race prejudice, which he shares with 90 percent of his co-religionists in the USA - for example, when he claims in 1977 that Germany in the 20th century offered the example of the "absolute rule of evil"³³.

Not Hitler's Germany, but American Jewry is the tyranny that had been strangling the American people long before Hitler was known in the USA, and FDR's phony war of liberation against Hitler was never undertaken to liberate America, but quite the opposite, to forever shackle the American people in the chains of Jewish slavery. There is hardly an adult in the United States today who has never heard a Jew boast that the day of Pearl Harbor - December 7, 1941 - was the greatest day in the history of world Jewry; and most Americans have heard and read this arrogant boast many, many times. While most Americans still loathe Jews today, unfortunately, 90 percent of them are so intimidated by the ruthless and brutal power of world Jewry - and not without reason - that they have never dared to criticize that boast, which best confirms that they are indeed slaves to Jewry.

Chase makes an unbeatable argument in his book for the thesis that the modern doctrine of Anglo-Saxon racial superiority - which only disappeared again during the post-1945 generation - was born in England in 1798, some twenty years after the American Declaration of Independence (with French military assistance) had created a second so-called Anglo-Saxon power³⁴. That was the year in which Thomas Malthus, a fanatical racist and Anglican

clergyman, published his famous Essay on Population³⁵. The amazing thing about all this is that there never was an Anglo-Saxon race, that it really only existed as a tawdry invention in the imaginations of some English historians, philosophers, theologians and xenophobes in general.

It was the German-American H. L. Mencken from Baltimore, Maryland, who pointed out several times in his journal³⁶ that the French, who helped the Americans against England after 1776, were racially not so different from the English, since the predominant blood in both countries at that time and for thousands of years before was Celtic. England had never been Anglo-Saxon in an anthropological-racial sense. Certainly, England, Scotland, and Ireland received a North Germanic-Viking admixture (Danes, Norwegians) and a West and East Germanic-Anglo-Saxon admixture, just as France received a similar Germanic infusion through the Vikings and Franks, Italy through Lombards and Goths, and Spain through Goths and Vandals. "There is no doubt that the admixture of the highly gifted and superior Germanic race has benefited all these six countries, but it seemed ridiculous when a famous English historian of the last century, Edward Freeman, author of the definitive ten-volume history of the Norman Conquest of England of 1066, spoke of the three homelands of the English-speaking peoples, referring to the forests of Germany, England and overseas - for there never was and never will be an English homeland in the forests of Germany.

The English are Celts, not Anglo-Saxons

To put it briefly, the whole absurd Anglo-Saxon myth in England and the USA was never more than what the Irish call *blarney*. It was deliberate wishful thinking and a hoax like so much else in modern English life³⁷. The English, not unlike the Irish, Scots, Welsh and Cornish, are first and foremost Celts, even if they have forgotten their original Gaelic language, which still survives in the four other Celtic countries of the British Isles. There were never enough Teutonic Danes, Norwegians, Angles or Saxons in England to transform this fundamentally Celtic people into something that could justifiably be called an Anglo-Saxon or Germanic people in the Freemanian fantasy sense. However, just as the French nobility, which ruled until 1789, was predominantly of Germanic blood, there was also a period of rule by a Saxon upper class in England, as well as a supremacy of a Norman ruling class after 1066.

Everyone knows that of all the main modern European languages, English is the most immature, changeable, underdeveloped and above all the youngest, in contrast to German and Russian, which, according to the Russian philologist Prince Mirsky, are *original languages* whose steady, organic development from origins thousands of generations ago can be traced back to the earliest Stone Age. When William Caxton started up the first English printing press - fifty

years later than Gutenberg (1400-1468) in Germany - he found that even a simple word like *egg* was pronounced in many different ways in different English counties, and even in the early 17th century Shakespeare - or whoever used that name - had to reinvent hundreds of English words in order to write his plays. The Norman upper classes in England had spoken only French for centuries after 1066, and the illiterate Celtic masses had got by as best they could with a mishmash of Gaelic, Germanic, Scandinavian and French dialects - with a heavy sprinkling of vulgar Church Latin - until finally the bastard language now called English appeared.

This new English language had something of an early flowering in the 17th century, but the literary tyrants and court poets John Dryden (1631-1700) and Alexander Pope (1688-1744) robbed this English of its juice and strength and banished Shakespeare until he was brought back to England from Germany in the 19th century by the Gehrüder Schlegels (August, 1767-1845; Friedrich, 1772-1829). In the meantime, however, the sterile and frosty English that still exists today had developed. Henry Mencken proved in a great philological study³⁸ that most of what Americans consider to be their original slang (dialect) is nothing more than a remnant of the rich English vernacular of the 17th century; but this American idiom had absorbed so much Yiddish during the last hundred years that it is no longer recognizable as the language that flourished in the time of the great Artemus Ward.

Oswald Spengler and the decline of the USA

The worldwide Anglo-Saxon racial myth was based on a fraud. The entire British Empire since the days of Elizabeth I, like the US Empire after the American Civil War, was founded on fraud and international crime. Fortunately for the world, the Anglo-Saxon myth is gone, the British Empire is gone, and the empire of the USA is fading away into a chaos of military defeat, economic collapse and general exploitation by its corrupt and parasitic ruling race, the Jewish plutocratic miscreants who have been in the saddle for three generations since 1913. Jewish misrule in the 20th century United States confirms Oswald Spengler's 1918 thesis in his *Decline of the West* that throughout history, despite the astonishing advantages that world Jewry has consistently derived from its excessive ambition and cold disregard for all other races, it always destroys its own position with a final burst of greed that either alarms or kills the host people on which Jewry feeds. Israel, with its stagnant population^u and enormous financial dependence on the USA and West Germany, is no exception to the rule.

James Malin, an outstanding philosopher of history of our century at the

University of Kansas, fought the mindless collectivism with which European and American intellectual history is approached in the works of James Harvey Robinson, Vernon Parrington, Merle Curti, Harvey Wish and John Dewey. Malin subsequently suffered professional and economic persecution of all kinds (including the need to have his major works printed privately at his own expense). For decades, Malin told his students at Kansas University that the most worthwhile books written in the United States would not be printed at all because of opposition from the Jewish media.

In one of his historiographical works³⁹ Malin was overly indulgent when he wrote: "In his >Untergang des Abendlandes< Oswald Spengler made a fundamental observation which subsequent events have almost given the status of a prophecy: He claimed that in the democracies of the 20th century the newspaper had completely supplanted the book from the intellectual life of the peoples." ⁴⁰

A group of academic journalists at the University of California at Berkeley recently expressed doubt that 90 percent of the American population had read even a single serious, non-pornographic book from cover to cover in the last ten years. In this context, it is worth recalling⁴¹ what Alfred Harmsworth (Lord Northcliffe, 1865-1922) said about the three categories of newspaper readers in the population.

George Orwell's "1984"⁴² was a realistic work depicting existing conditions under the yoke of Big Brother World Jewry - and not a utopian work about a hypothetical future in the style of books by Samuel Butler⁴³, Edward Bellamy⁴⁴, Aldous Huxley⁴⁵ or Sinclair Lewis⁴⁶. In fact, Orwell originally wanted to call the book "1948" ⁷⁴

The "Century of Peace 1814-1914"

Malin lashed out at all the vain complacency and nonsense of American court historians about the legendary brilliance of US foreign policy since Waterloo, or more precisely since Napoleon's first abdication even before the Waterloo interlude. The court historians praise the US for having stayed out of all world wars during the four generations from 1814 to 1914, after having participated - first as colonists and later as an independent state - in the six world wars of the five generations from 1689 to 1814, all six of which (like the 250 years of medieval warfare between England and France) had been instigated by the wanton excesses of British imperialism. However, since there were no world wars at all during the four generations 1814-1914, this was not a significant achievement, and one involuntarily thinks of Hjalmar Schacht, who stupidly praised the American puppet state in Bonn in 1968, that it had not

waged war under American auspices since its foundation - when in reality West Germany had been under constant foreign military occupation since 1949, based on the Allied conquest of Germany in 1945 (an achievement that had only been possible thanks to the espionage and sabotage of the two-thousand-year-old German treasonous elite within Germany during the Second World War).

Malin stated in another book⁴⁸ that 1814-1914 is only called the century of peace because there were no global conflicts. Yet there were a myriad of smaller wars, including American ones. British imperialists also attempted to unleash world wars on many occasions during these four generations and failed only by accident.

Thus France and its allies capitulated to England in Egypt in 1840 rather than stand up to a worldwide English coalition - two decades after Napoleon I had been assassinated by his British jailers. This humiliating French capitulation was the main reason for the fall of the moderate Orleans dynasty in France a few years later - an event that in turn led to the bloody 1848 revolutions across Europe.

England also tried to turn the Crimean War of 1853-1856 into a world war with the aim of dismembering Russia, but its plans were narrowly thwarted by a diplomatic campaign by Hohenzollern Prussia in the interests of peace. England was so furious with Prussia for this that it destroyed the concert of European powers and refused Prussia an active role at the Paris Congress of 1856.

Although England was content with a peaceful triumph and a new diplomatic humiliation of Russia at the Berlin Congress of 1878 (although it also pushed through the tragic dismemberment of Bulgaria at this conference), a new world war could easily have emerged from the bitter Anglo-Russian tensions of 1877 had not a man like Bismarck used all his strength for world peace.

When England stood in the way of the French at Paschodal-Sudan in 1898, a new world war between the Franco-Russian Dual Alliance and the British Empire would almost certainly have ensued had France not capitulated unconditionally to British military pressure.

After this new and tragic French humiliation, the French Third Republic remained a mere satellite of England for forty-two years until its demise in 1940. This end of the Third Republic was in turn a catastrophe caused solely by the excesses of British imperialism and the fact that England succeeded in blocking the Franco-German rapprochement that had been longed for for decades by Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm II in Germany and by leading Frenchmen such as Jules Ferry (1832-1893) and Joseph Caillaux (1863-1944), and that England instead drove France into senseless wars against Germany in 1914 and 1939.

So England tried four times (and a fifth example would be the Second Moroccan Crisis of 1911 and the dangerous warmongering of Lloyd George and Winston Churchill) to start a new world war in vain. In bringing about the two world wars of 1914 and 1939, England - with constant support from American warmongering - was disastrously successful: these two wars were - like the six world wars of the period 1689-1814 - exclusively "made in England".

America's "wise isolationism" before Wilson

When American court historians boast in every second-rate textbook in American public and private schools since 1945 that the United States was not involved in the world wars instigated by England, it is no less ridiculous and grotesque than the silly and antiquated Anglo-Saxon race legend itself. Malin writes: "The century of world peace, 1814-1914, is an extremely important unique fact in the history of the United States and, moreover, a significant one. This so-called century of relative peace was enjoyed by the United States "simply because there was no war, that is, no war on a world scale. The whole question of so-called isolation in American history is as simple as that.

In this way, Malin put an end to the absurd legend that the US had lived in Ming China-style isolation until Woody Wilson unnecessarily led the country into the First World War in 1917 - a war in which the US was not directly interested and in which the violations of international law on the British side were infinitely greater than on the German side. In fact, such German violations, when they occurred, were without exception legal reprisals against previous British provocations. The world would never have heard of German violations of international law had not Britain begun them in the form of the infamous Cabinet Order of October 1914, which violated every precept of civilized naval warfare since the days of Bynkerschoek, the great 18th-century Dutch international lawyer who achieved, among other things, the general adoption of the famous three-mile zone in coastal waters.

Malin recalled the radical humanism and false worship of the so-called perfectible scientific man by Condorcet during the French Revolution (1789-1799), noting that the so-called Century of Peace "contributed to a particular American version of the illusion of progress"⁵¹. This worship of a non-existent, legendary human perfectibility - in which the sacrosanct trinity of American pragmatist philosophers, Peirce, James and Dewey, participated - was the product of American Illuminati Freemasonry under the spiritual leadership of subversive world Jewry^{S2^}.

It was no coincidence that a mediocre man of no particular talent like Earl Warren - who shared with his Norwegian-born father a fanatical attachment to Marxism in general and Stalinism in particular - was elected Grand Master of the Freemasons of all California in 1935 and thus became the head of 700 Masonic lodges with 150000 members⁵³. Whether Warren actually had a membership card of the Communist Party of the USA - like Gus Hall, Bill Foster, Frank Meyer or Earl Browder - is unimportant. In any case, Senator Joseph McCarthy expressed himself correctly when he remarked in the US Senate that he did not insist that Warren was a Communist, but that Warren had been the best friend of the American Communists at the time in question.

There are press photos showing Warren's friend, the black legendary hero Martin Luther King, attending his communist training school in Tennessee; but it is unimportant whether King was formally a member of the Communist Party, as was the wealthy Negro opera singer Paul Robeson. After Warren urged his friend and fellow Stalin admirer, President Eisenhower, to appoint him Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court (1953) - a position for which Warren had no discernible qualifications - he took an intensive course in Jewish Talmudic law in New York City. It is unimportant whether Warren also joined a New York synagogue.

Warren was equally inspired by a belief in the perfectibility of man and a desire to eradicate the white race from the United States forever in favor of an American of tea-colored pigmentation - the new American Negro mass man. That was his position in 1954 when he announced the Supreme Court's ruling in *Brown v. Topeka* - a ruling that cost the bankrupt United States billions of dollars more and destroyed the last vestiges of the traditional racial and socioeconomic structure of American society.

Like Condorcet, Warren was a Jacobin. Like Stalin, Warren was an ardent supporter of Bolshevism. The specific details of his list of honors and memberships are unimportant. Immediately after Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, the same Warren rushed to General De Witt, commander of the Fourth US Army in San Francisco, and assured him that, as Attorney General of California, he intended to persecute all US citizens of Japanese descent in the most cruel manner, even against the opposition of the popular Governor Olsen. By this he meant the confiscation of their private property without compensation and their incarceration in concentration camps - where most of the inmates of both sexes were subsequently beaten and some even killed ⁵⁴.

Like Martin Luther King, Warren may - or may not - have been a formal member of the Communist Party. Just as Stalin before 1917 simultaneously served the Tsarist secret police Ochrana and worked for Lenin in the Bolshevik

Party, Warren was used to running with the foxes and the hounds at the same time, posing as a radical and a reactionary side by side. However, one fact about this cold-blooded and devious criminal Earl Warren (1891-1974) cannot be denied: He was a consummate Stalinist. Although he was only mediocre compared to his master, this explains Warren's popularity with the Illuminati Freemasons and world Jewry, as well as his personal esteem by Eleanor Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower⁵⁵

It was fitting and appropriate that President Lyndon Johnson sent him, Warren, as the head of the American delegation to Winston Churchill's funeral in 1965. Certainly, Churchill had called Stalin the "bloody baboon of Bolshevism" in 1921, but in 1941, twenty years later and under the tutelage of his Jewish master Bernard Baruch, he celebrated Stalin before the British House of Commons as "so great a man, so wise a ruler"⁵⁶

Anglo-Saxon and Jewish master race

Malin thought of all the Anglo-American self-congratulation and, alongside it, the servile official Anglo-American worship of Bolshevism and Zionism - and found it strange. When Pétain had saved France in 1940, official London and official Washington/D.C. reviled France as much as Germany and have continued to revile, slander and persecute these two culturally leading nations of the West ever since⁵⁷ Yet Malin's research has scientifically proven that of the truly decisive discoveries in the entire West between the years 1500 and 1900, more than 50 percent were French and German discoveries, with Germany leading over every other single country. Malin made only one mistake: Copernicus (1473-1543) was a German, not a Pole. He was a German by ethnicity, was born in Thorn, an exclusively German city, studied under German professors alone and only spoke Latin and German, not Polish⁵⁸

Chase claimed that Malthus's Anglo-Saxon racial legend of 1798 caused much hardship during the next six generations to Jews, 90 percent of whom were of Khazar-Mongolian blood, and also to white non-Nordic groups, such as southern Italians⁵⁹ He aptly recalled that the American Johnson Immigration Act of 1924, which reserved 50 percent of the total U.S. immigration quota for the British Isles, severely discriminated against "non-Nordic immigration to the United States"⁶⁰ . Chase, who was under the self-delusion that Talmudic Judaism constituted the only so-called true master race on earth-a delusion explicitly rejected and condemned in all four Gospels-complained bitterly that in England and the USA there were still "the old scientific racists, those who had their heyday between 1798 and the Nazi Götterdämmerung of 1945"⁶¹.

Thomas Maltbus (176fr-1834) wanted to eliminate inferior types from the English race, and he wrote in 1826: "We must in honor and justice deprive the poor of the right to support in all forms. The child, comparatively speaking, is of little value to society, because others can instantly take his place. "62 The Malthusian ethic was applied twenty years later to justify the English policy of genocide in Ireland, that is, a blockade of subjugated Ireland in the midst of peace during the three years of Irish famine from 1846, when Ireland's staple food, the potato, failed. Not counting the Irish who were able to emigrate as serfs to the USA and Latin America, this policy proved successful in that it reduced the Irish population by 50 percent during those three years. Those Irish men, women and children who wanted to enter the English workhouses in the Pale Dublin area (part of the English concentration camp system created by Elizabeth I and maintained for three hundred years until the middle of the 19th century), Irish volunteer slave laborers who wanted to work sixteen hours a day for bare survival, were either expelled, shot or hanged.

Chase accurately reports that Herbert Spencer made the official British Maltbus approach to the world's population problems even more brutal. The British destroyed the high quality Hindu textile industry to reduce the population through artificially induced famines for which no relief was provided. Spencer created "the intellectual aberration called Social Darwinism "63.

Galton and the beginnings of eugenics

Of all these hateful Englishmen with their insatiable thirst for blood, Chase hated Sir Francis Galton (1832-1911; ennobled by Edward VII only in 1909) the most. Chase claimed that Galton was "the inventor of eugenics "64 (which is an exaggeration, for Galton was merely a disciple of the Austrian monk and geneticist-oenius Gregor Mendel, 1822-1884). Among Galton's American admirers was James Hili, who robbed the Pacific Northwest of the USA after the 1870s through the instrument of his corrupt railroad system - just as John Jacob Astor would have liked to do in the past - as well as John D. Rockefeller Sr, who worshipped the Social Darwinist idea that "the growth of a great enterprise" was "merely the survival of the fittest", and Andrew Carnegie, the corrupt American steel monopolist who proclaimed that Darwin, Spencer and Galton had "found the truth of evolution "65^.

Galton proclaimed in a paper66 the need for comprehensive measures to weed out unfit elements from the Anglo-Saxon master race. The word eugenics itself was derived by Galton from the Greek word for "from a good family "67^

Galton also introduced the term dysgenic as a synonym for low birth and racial inferiority68^ Galton's extensive knowledge of the history and sociology of world Jewry was particularly disappointing to Chase. For example, on

October 17, 1884, Galton wrote: "The Jews have specialized in a parasitic mode of life among other peoples, and ...it has yet to be proved that they are capable of performing by their own efforts the manifold duties of a civilized nation. "69 Galton's valid observation was based on three thousand years of history, and the century that followed Galton produced nothing to modify his assertion. In particular, the thirty-year parasitic existence of the state of Israel would enable Galton, were he alive today, to formulate his assertion even more clearly and rigorously. Chase notes that Winston Churchill and Harold Laski (the Labour leader at the time of the 1945 election that threw Churchill out of office) were both "ardent supporters of Galton "70 . In short, almost everyone in official England shared Galton's views - an observation by Chase that makes Mahan's influence on the 1895-1945 era in the US understandable, where English opinions were adopted like Parisian fashions7^

Chase reports that in America, President Teddy Roosevelt, an ardent Mahan disciple, was also an "early American convert to the eugenic creed "72. Teddy wrote to the eugenics section of the American Breeders' Association on January 14, 1913: "It is clear that in the future, if racial qualities are to be promoted, it must be done chiefly by favoring the fertility of the valuable types...At present we are doing the opposite. Nothing limits the fertility of the below-average. "73

Eugenic coercive measures in the USA

Chase proved that all US presidents from Teddy to Frank Roosevelt-including Woody Wilson-called themselves disciples of Galton74. Galton imitated Maltbus in 1891 by warning against "excessive population growth "75 . The first law in the world in favour of forced sterilization of the poor and sick was passed by the US state of Indiana in 1907-twenty-nine years after the repeal of the last anti-Jewish law in New Hampshire-and local authorities in Indiana were given a free hand in sterilizing "proven criminals, idiots, women abusers and imbeciles.

Within a very short time after the successful experiment in Indiana, similar sterilization and biosocial control laws were passed by thirty other U.S. states, which together made up most of the country, as well as in the teeming American colony of Puerto Rico, where vast numbers of Spanish-speaking men and women were quickly sterilized." The passage of this legislation reached its peak during Wilson's presidency, and Wilson himself emphasized his support for it at every opportunity78.

Chase freely notes that Adolf Hitler, who wanted to become a Catholic priest as a boy, was only eighteen years old when the pioneering Indiana law was

enacted. No doubt Chase was thinking of Hitler's 1939 attempt to introduce a similar-albeit more moderate-eugenics program to the American one in Germany. However, Hitler's American-style eugenic program was immediately opposed and stopped by the Catholic Church, even though Germany had an abnormally high percentage of mentally handicapped people. Although German Catholics made up slightly less than 50 percent of the German population in 1939 (20 percent in the U.S. at the time), they were superbly organized and protected by Hitler's Concordat with the Vatican (a kind of protection American Catholics never enjoyed). German Catholics were able to stop Hitler's eugenics program throughout Germany in a very short time. In fact, the plan hardly left the drawing board.

Without doubt the most influential economist in the USA between the Civil War and the First World War was Professor William G. Sumner of Yale University. Sumner was also Episcopal Rector of the American branch of the official Anglican Church of England and also a social Darwinist. He proclaimed in the English manner that "a man may curse his fate to be born into an inferior race, but God will not regard such curses "80^.

Warnings about Jewish mass immigration

Henry George was an outstanding socio-economic reformer in San Francisco. His magnum opus "Progress and Poverty" of 1876 was later adopted by Denmark as an economic bible and changed this previously backward and indolent nation to its advantage. George taught that investment should automatically reduce tax liability, while the absence of investment should incur punitive taxes. Needless to say, the American plutocratic evil-doers were unwilling to tolerate progressive reforms of this kind, and so Henry George's impact on the US socio-economic sector - however many Henry George societies there have been over the years - has remained nil. Fighting Bob LaFollette had intended to advance George's program at the presidential level, but that opportunity was lost when he was stripped of the presidency in 1912 as a result of Teddy Roosevelt's treachery. Henry George wrote in 1883 during the early stages of mass Jewish immigration to the United States, "Where will we get a dumping ground in a few years? Does it lessen our problems that human garbage is able to cast its vote?8t"

Henry George feared what was actually to happen within thirty years, namely, that the Khazar Jewish mob-with its benighted golem-fix ideas and its Talmudic hatred and prejudice-would become the master race in the U.S., the master class, the rulers of the entire wicked business of American plutocratic miscreants, and the group before whom all elected OS presidents became mere

servile puppets. Above all, this complete Jewish victory was merely to whet the appetite of world Jewry in its determination to destroy the White race in America and stamp out the last vestiges of traditional Christianity in the USA.

Dr. Isidor Singer and the Christians of the USA

Not much more than a decade after the completion of total Jewish victory with the inauguration of Woody Wilson's presidential era in 1913, the Jewish campaign's plan to destroy any form of independent and meaningful Christianity was openly announced and published - despite the worldwide destruction Wilson had wrought in World War I - in the book by Dr. In it, the Jewish prophets involuntarily appeared together with Jesus, the Aramaic-speaking Messiah of mankind from Galilee, an Aryan landscape that had been devastated and conquered by the Jewish king Herades the Great two generations before Jesus' teaching mission; However, the Babylonian Sanhedrin, which compiled the infamous Talmud - which openly called for genocide, sexual perversion and crime - was gladly included in Singer's book, as was the preceding Sanhedrin in Jerusalem, which accomplished the murder of Jesus (thanks to the timidity of the Roman defenders of the *ius gentium*, whose military reinforcements against the fanatical Jewish mob had been held up by a storm at Cyprus).

On the eve of the crucifixion, as a few of Jesus' Galilean-Aryan disciples admired the grandiose luxury of the Jewish temple complex in Jerusalem - with its whorehouses, taverns and usurious moneylending offices - Jesus calmly remarked, according to the Gospel account, that some of them would live to see a time when not one stone of this worldly and tumultuous complex would be left upon another - a prophecy that was fully fulfilled in 70 AD, some forty years after the crucifixion.

One thinks of the prediction by the Illuminati leader Foster Bailey⁸³ that the USA would fall within forty years of the barbaric destruction of Germany in 1945.

Today's American Federal Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches are both dominated by world Jewry. That is why, after attending the 1948 World Council of Churches conference in Amsterdam, Netherlands, Congregationalist pastor Ed Opitz⁸⁴ branded the modern councils of churches and all their works as satanic - along with such leading defenders as the infamous Reinhold Niebuhr Opitz founded The Remnant, a nationwide American organization led for decades by Ed Opitz and made up of modern-day Catholic Christians - half clergy and half laity. Opitz travels the country every

spare minute for regional meetings with his members, all of whom are suffering from economic persecution at the hands of world Jewry in particular and the American establishment in general. Unlike other American organizations, you can't afford covenant meetings.

The power of B'nai B'rith

In this 20th century of doublethink and Big Brother, where everyone thinks the opposite of what they pretend to think, Century Magazine (later called Christian Century) became the organ of the Federal Council of Churches, that is, the American clergy who now form the overwhelming majority and are nominally part of Christendom, but in a very real sense also of Judaism and world Jewry, which includes both Jewish Bolshevism and Jewish Zionism. The Federal Council of Churches has for years taken as an example the all-powerful B'nai B'rith, founded in New York City in 1843 by influential German Jews at a time when there were only 15,000 Jews in the entire United States⁸⁶^ All of its founders were born in Germany, and most of them were Masonic Illuminati⁸⁷^ With the beginning of the worldwide Jewish Kramola attack on Tsarist Russia - after the failure of the Paris Commune - the B'nai B'rith sought to formally extend its ecumenical Jewish organization, which had originated in the USA, to Europe, and so on 21 March 1882 the German Reichsloog was founded. March 1882, the German Imperial Lodge of the B'nai

B'rith was founded in Berlin⁸⁸^ The mission of the B'nai B'rith in its fully active years was to justify Jewish Bolshevism and Zionism to the world and to silence all constructive criticism of the nihilistic and terrorist aspects of Judaism's worldwide campaigns through the use of its powerful Anti-Defamation League⁸⁹^

In his 1924 preface, the B'nai B'rith accomplice Singer was enthusiastic about an essay he incorrectly labeled ecumenical, "What I would like to preach, "90 by the Protestant pastor Allan Hunter. Hunter falsely linked the Hebrews of the Old Testament with modern Khazarian world Jewry and its program of world domination, and both Hunter and Singer based their views on the immense achievements of world Jewry under Wilson's presidency^

Throughout his book, Singer equated the word tyranny with what he calls the bigotry of traditional Christianity. Thus, he hailed the modern trends in American universities and colleges, within whose walls the three tides of Marxist atheist Bolshevism, secular messianic Zionism, and Talmudic Judaism were crashing. Singer proclaimed that these American institutions of higher

learning in the 20th century had become the "beacons" that "illuminate the road leading to the final triumph of the people over tyranny. "92^ In short, American colleges and universities, along with the mass media, the so-called Christian churches, and the financial corporations, had become the tools of the domination of world Jewry in the United States.

As a recognized spokesman for the American branch of B'nai B'rith, Singer made no effort in public to hide his enthusiasm for Karl Marx (1818-1883), the satanic organizer of Jewish Bolshevism: "Seventy-five years ago Karl Marx made his famous appeal to the manual workers of the world to unite. His observance has brought about tremendous changes in the economic and political face of humanity. The same appeal might now fitly be made to the intellectual workers of the old and new continents, calling upon them to lay now in their turn the foundations of a permanent aristo-democracy, the ideal welfare state of the future, in which the sovereignty of the mind over the tyranny now still exercised by the brutal instincts of man should be securely established. "93

This was the same Jewish messianic nonsense of "One World" that Moses Hess had passed on to Karl Marx, who had originally been a serious bourgeois journalist, the nonsense that inspired Marx to turn Hegel on his head, to transform a glorious idealist philosophy into a mendacious materialist one, and to sow ideological hatred, political discord and bloody class struggle throughout the world.

Singer called the Amos Society "a kind of spiritual >Society of Cincinnati<94 (this was a subversive organization of 18th century American Revolutionary War veterans imbued with the secret esoteric rites of Freemasonry). The goal of d^Amos Society was to realize the Jewish version of the Declaration of Independence of 1776, namely the Declaration of Human and Civil Rights of the French Revolution of 1791, which brought about the first political emancipation of Jewry in France from 1791 to 1807. The Jews re-established this temporary victory on a permanent basis in the course of the bloody French Revolution of 1848 - a revolution that was a kind of pocketbook edition of the Great Revolution of 1789. Napoleon III, who was elected President of France in 1848, became Emperor of the French a few years later in a coup d'état, but he lacked the courage of his famous uncle and shied away from revoking the achievements of the Jews for fear of worldwide Jewish economic sanctions - as much as he would have liked to. Finally, there was Theodor Herzl's doctrine of a special chauvinistic and authoritarian Jewish state, while at the same time maintaining the Jewish stranglehold on all American and European nations9s.

It was due to Isidor Singer's propaganda that Porter Sargent, Sr., the foremost American educational expert of the 20th century, placed so much emphasis on what he called the continuing struggle to control the minds of American youth. Singer proclaimed that "the present book is dedicated in love and respect to the academic youth of America "96 . This Judas-like love and respect was to accompany the venomous sting of Singer's radical humanist scorpion.

Singer counted on successful missionary efforts by Jewish youth among American Christian youth on the way to realizing his goal: "Our appeal ... is directed even more directly to the 15,000 college boys and girls who are bound to the Hebrew prophets by the physical bond of race. "97 Singer's radical view also displayed the usual passionate Jewish either-or fanaticism: "Either the Jew still has a special task as a Jew in God's household, or he is at the end of his historical strength. But if he still has a mission, he must ... begin to write a new chapter in the history of the synagogue. "98

The purpose of achieving a total and final Jewish intellectual takeover in the U.S.-along with the economic and political-should have been quite clear to the most limited reader of the introduction to this arrogant Jewish book-a book that was distributed throughout the U.S. and made available to the vast majority of Protestant clergy and Catholic priests for their instruction, as well as to teachers in both public and private schools. (No effort was made to gain adherents among American Russian Orthodox priests - the final Jewish destruction of Russia had been completed only seven years before the publication of Singer's book, so efforts in this direction would clearly have been futile).

Edward Filene, a Boston Jewish millionaire, wrote an introductory essay to Singer's book. His brother Lincoln Filene was president of the huge department store business William Filene & Sons Company and also sat on the Business Advisory Council of the US Department of Commerce. Both Filenes also sat on the Harvard Board of Overseers, chaired by Frank Roosevelt's mentor Grenville Clark, and in 1933 President Roosevelt appointed Lincoln Filene to chair the all-powerful Industrial Advisory Board of his National Recovery Administration.

Edward Filene addressed a complex message to American youth in the pages of Singer's 1924 book: "The great war (1914-1918) marked the end of a certain phase of a great epoch in America...Social progress has lagged behind material progress. Injustice has been done to great masses of our people without evil intent. The time is ripe for a social program of justice and good-will in our own country ... and also to set up international cooperation programs. " 99

One can be sure that it had not escaped Edward Filene's attention that in 1920, on their only opportunity in the 20th century to vote on a foreign policy issue, the American electorate had sensationally rejected the Jewish notion of "one world" government-whether through the League of Nations or some other organization undermining national sovereignty. Like all leading American Jews, Filene had not the slightest respect for the will of the people or what Rousseau called the General Will. The conclusion that American Jewry subsequently came to was that the American public was to be subjugated to so-calledp. Bipartisan foreign policy-that is, never again to be allowed to vote on any foreign policy issue. Nearly 60 years have passed since 1920 without a new popular vote on foreign policy in the United States. In the meantime, Jewish ideas and ideals-as utterly alien as they were to every American tradition-have been inculcated and imposed upon Americans-along with the worship of Jew-style homosexuality, lesbianism, Reconstruction-style Negro supremacy, and every other Jewish invention that was repugnant to the broad mass of the American people.

The Jewish plutocratic miscreants had long since adopted Commodore Cornelius Vanderbilt's Civil War-era slogan: "To hell with publicity!" Filene knew from personal contacts with the world Zionist conferences in Basel, Switzerland, beginning in 1897, that international conspiratorial organizations were paying off for American Jewry on a global scale.

Louis Brandeis was in San Francisco in 1897 when he first read about the groundbreaking World Jewish Congress in Basel in the local "Chronicle". Brandeis turned to his wife and remarked that here, for the first time in his life, he had found a cause to which he could fervently dedicate his life. It was not the cause of the USA that inspired his enthusiasm. He devoted 90 percent of his time to Zionism from 1897 until his death in 1941, 44 years later, and rose to become the leader of all American Zionists. As he grew older, much of the organizational work was done by Rabbi Stephen Wise - first from Budapest/Hungary, later from Portland/Oregon and finally from New York City. That Brandeis thus consecrated himself to the foreign ideology and foreign nationalism of Zionism did not stop President Woody Wilson from making Brandeis his mentor for American domestic policy and appointing him Associate Justice of the all-powerful U.S. Supreme Court - a post Brandeis held for 35 years. So a wealthy American Jew was able to put the Zionist dream of a secular and chauvinistic Israel first and still get his pick of any US supreme court or administrative office - because from 1933, Jewry controlled the US presidency, which made the important appointments.

Filene emphasized the need for a more intensive program of Jewish rooting

among the gullible and often ignorant Christians of the United States: "...any program of greater social justice, if it is to succeed in this generation (1920-1945), must have the support of organized religion. "100^ It was the Jew's intention to find the "common ground" (a formula soon adopted by all American pro-totalitarian, so-called modern liberals) to melt down and equalize all the major nations and religions of the earth, except sacrosanct Judaism. A good example was the Soviet Union, where under Jewish leadership and control Russia had ceased to be Russia and had become cosmopolitan" ^ Filene called for a total Jewish mobilization and a fanatical and worldwide collectivist Jewish effort: "Jews as individuals have rendered great service to America and the world. Organized Judaism, however, has lagged somewhat behind. "102

The world leadership claim of Judaism

The American Federal Council of Churches approached the Jewish ideal, and Filene assured Jewish youth that their efforts in the service of Judaism deserved the greatest support from all Jews Filene proclaimed that "no race has so much to gain from programs for social and international justice as the Jews. If Jewish energy and imagination are brought to bear upon them, the chances of success will be greatly enhanced...The oppressed masses of Jews throughout the world will benefit greatly"^^.

Singer assured his Jewish and Christian readers that the only worthwhile human destiny was the Jewish one: "The Jew ... has now the great opportunity of inserting the social keystone in the arch of the bridge to the future of man" ^^ Singer describes the Nordic, Romanic and Slavic races as decadent and spiritually exhausted, adding, "The Jew constitutes the only untapped reserve of racial superiority in the civilized world of today."106 If a united thrust of secular and religious Jewry could create a one-world utopia along the lines that had been realized by the Jews of the Soviet Union, "then the Jewish Church could thereby justify its age-old claim to be the world's first aristo-democracy."^ Singer believed, that the goyim (the non-Jewish human cattle) of the earth could be forced to become subjects of a permanent Jewish world dictatorship, and that in gratitude for Messianic Jewish social, economic and political leadership "mankind (would) be willing to have the proud inscription Am Segullah (Chosen People)on the national escutcheon ...of world Jewry"^^ Singer argued that world Jewry must not slacken in its worldwide drive for domination, for "only ...by carrying out ...the program of social justice can the Jews hope to rid themselves once and for all of the clouds of prejudice against themselves ...It is a specifically Jewish program" 1o9.

Singer proclaimed that the Jewish race alone possessed every characteristic

of human greatness and that "the Jew is able to unite in his person the enthusiasm of the prophet (Lenin and world-wide Jewish Bolshevism) and the knowledge of the man of science (Chaim Weizmann, the Anglo-Jewish chemist and leader of world Zionism). "1^ Jewish revolutionaries of antiquity wreaked havoc and destruction among the Greeks, Roman and the peoples of the Fertile Crescent (Palestine, Lebanon, Syria and Iraq). *Singer took pleasure in addressing the 20th century in this ancient Jewish revolutionary and terroristic tradition, for "Amos was the first prophet to question the foundations of the social life of his time". For Singer, the low point of world Jewry was reached at the time of the mission of Jesus, the son of enslaved Aryan Galileans. Singer hoped to convince Christians that the young carpenter was irrelevant to their faith and that they should turn away from "the dark period of the four centuries that preceded and followed the birth of Christ (200 BC - AD 200)"^

Christ a forerunner of Marx?

Talmudic Judaism had taught for centuries that Jesus was a moral leper, a pimp and a panderer, but Singer thought that by means of a concession to 20th century Christians, Jesus could perhaps be saved in the political realm as a link in the worldwide chain of revolutionary events, if his teaching could be seen as the "equivalent of the doctrine of Karl Marx (sic!)"ⁱⁱ⁴. Singer reminded his readers that Jesus, like the Count of Saint-Simon (1760-1825), was not Jewish, but that Saint-Simon's six most important disciples in France were famous French Jews^ (The non-Jew Auguste Comte, leading French radical humanist of his time, also had predominantly Jewish disciples). If Jesus could be seen as a communist like Marx, then Judaism was at least able to accept him in the political sphere, even if it denied him any legitimate religious role^{H6^}.

Singer praised Karl Marx at length as the most influential and important Jew of the modern era, who had shaken up the world even more than the Rothschild clan, which had dominated the overseas imperialist adventures of England, France and the USA since 1815^{117^}

Walter Rathenau, the Jewish industrialist who betrayed the German Kaiser during the First World War and wrote a book denouncing him immediately after his fall (after feigning friendship with Wilhelm II until the end of his reign), was praised by Singer in a way that was second only to Marx's *ruhme*. Singer called Rathenau's father, the Jewish speculator who founded AEG, the "Thomas Edison of Germany", although Emil Rathenau, unlike Edison, had invented nothing of importance"⁹ Singer boasted that Walter Rathenau, heir to his father's plutocratic empire, had absolute control over 70000 German skilled workers during the First World War¹²⁰. Walter Rathenau also wrote a few

general sociological essays on Germany after 1918, which had no lasting significance¹²¹, but Singer claimed that these essays "deserved to be placed alongside the fundamental classic of sociological literature, >Das Kapital< by Karl Marx "¹²².

Singer was writing just two years after the infamous Rapallo Treaty between Walter Rathenau - then Foreign Minister of the Weimar Republic - and a secret team of Soviet negotiators. It was an agreement that, had it been carried out, would have turned Germany into a Soviet satellite at a time when Rathenau was supposedly negotiating with non-communist states in nearby Genoa. It was this pact with the Soviets-and not the book against the Kaiser-that prompted German students to assassinate the fanatical Rathenau. Singer gave Rathenau his highest praise as "a passionate Jew "¹²³.

David Lubin, an early American Zionist

Singer reminded his readers that there was nothing like a Jewish religion in the conventional sense, for "politics, religion and economics formed an indissoluble unity ... from the time of the Maccabees to the destruction of the Temple" ¹²⁴.

Singer also gave special praise to Joseph Fels (1854-1914), the wealthy Jewish soap manufacturer who financed all the early international Bolshevik conferences, including those attended by Lenin and Stalin¹²⁵. Singer claims: "Joseph Fels was goodness personified. "¹²⁶

Another great friend of both Bolshevism and Zionism chosen by Singer was David Lubin (1849-1920), a Jew from Kresy, Poland, whose experience in usury and trade made him an enormous fortune in California by 1884-when he was only 35-which enabled him to retire and devote all his money, time, energy and passion to the radical Jewish causes he admired. Lubin, who was born in the Russian Empire¹ eich, visited both his country of origin and Arab Palestine. In the former, he supported the Jewish-terrorist Kramola campaign against the Tsardom; in the latter, he established relations with the Turkish rulers and bought Arab land for Jewish settlement in support of the Rothschild program. By 1914, the Jewish share of the total population of Palestine had risen to 5 percent. The British Foreign Secretary Lord Balfour and the Rothschilds agreed in the Balfour Declaration of 1917 that 5 percent (think of the 7 percent Jews in the USA in the 1970s) was a broad enough basis to proclaim a national Jewish fatherland in Arab Palestine.

When a new economic depression hit the U.S. in 1893, Lubin bought up vast tracts of California farmland at ridiculously low prices so that urban Jews could be taught agriculture in preparation for Palestine^^ The shortage of Jews willing

to become farmers was remedied after World War II by forced deportations of unwilling Jews from North Africa and West Asia to Palestine under treaty. There, their children had to make do with eight years of schooling - compared to an average of twenty years for American and European Jews - creating a permanent pool of cheap Jewish agricultural labor.

Singer noted that "Lubin was deeply interested in Palestine ... as any Jew worth his salt should be or is"ⁿ And Singer further notes that Lubin was one of a large number of prominent American Jews who had a close personal relationship with OS President Woodrow Wilson¹²⁹.

Kaufmann Kohler's "ecumenical compromise"

In the second part of his book, entitled "International Justice", Singer carefully developed his program, according to which the American Jews were to lead the rest of the OS population into worldwide adventures. His role model was the man he considered "America's greatest living Jewish theologian," "Dr. Kaufmann Kohler."ⁿ ⁰ Kohler had discovered the theological formula that would enable Jews to channel the practical efforts of religiously minded Christian Americans. Kohler was chief rabbi of Temple Beth-El in New York City and had served as president of Hebrew Union College, which was the most prestigious Jewish institution of higher learning in the United States until the rise of Yeshiva University in New York City, now the wealthiest of all American universities, with a 1:3 faculty-to-student ratio. Yeshiva is an exclusive Jewish university that encourages its graduates to serve in Israel.

The Kaufmann Kohler-Formet disregards the importance of the Christian Gospels as a source for the historical and religious role of Jesus because "the true story of Jesus is so shrouded in legend ... that it is very difficult for an unbiased reader to arrive at the true historical facts" ¹³¹ (the biased readers are obviously the traditional Christians). Kohler overturned the New Testament by denying that Jesus' mission was to all mankind, claiming that Jesus was rather "a bold religious and social reformer who pushed for a regeneration of Judaism" ¹³². Kohler patronizingly proclaimed that in Jesus "modern Judaism ... reclaims one of its greatest sons", but that Jesus was devoid of divinity and ordinary human clay who did not reach the rank of the prophets of the Old Testament, and that Judaism in any case "denies that a single man ... holds the key to multifaceted truth" ¹³³.

Kohler thus dictated the religious and political fate of Jesus according to Jewish wishful thinking. He aimed to bring Jew and Goy together on the basis of what he claimed was a common ecumenical compromise regarding the place of Jesus in the basement of the so-called Jewish aristo-democracy. Kohler

triumphantly predicted that once Christians accepted the Jewish version of Jesus, "synagogue and church will unite." ¹³⁴ However twisted this theology may have been, the aftermath has confirmed that Kaufmann Kohler was a reliable prophet.

Dr. I. K. Funk, a former Lutheran pastor who became president of the prestigious New York publishing house Funk & Wagnalls, converted to the Jewish view of Jesus at a 1901 Jesus symposium hosted by the rabbis of New York (although certain financial factors may have had a more decisive effect on Funk than abstract theological considerations). In any case, Funk's conversion reinforced Kohler's belief that all prominent and wealthy Christians could be converted, and that the moneyed American masses would follow them. Subsequently, this proved to be a remarkably shrewd calculation. Guided by this thought, Kohler presided over a rabbinical school for twenty years - with the avowed aim of consolidating Jewish intellectual domination over the feeble-minded and intellectually inferior Christians of the United States ¹³⁵.

Ivan Bloch, the friend of Theodor Herzl

Another of Singer's favorite heroes was the clever Polish Jew Ivan Bloch (1836-1902), who made a huge fortune in the Russian Empire by raising international loans for railroad construction. Singer claims that Bloch was the "godfather" of the first Hague Conference on International Arbitration and Arms Limitation of 1899, because it was Bloch who convinced the Tsar that while Russia was expanding its enormous railroad network, it could no longer keep pace with Germany and Austria-Hungary in the heavy artillery sector (the decisive weapon of land warfare at the turn of the century) unless there was something of the nature of a temporary international armament standstill agreement¹³⁶. Bloch was a prolific writer (in Russian). He published nine books on Russian railroads and Russian economic history between the Berlin Congress of 1878 and the end of the century. Although secretly a fanatically religious Jew, Bloch made a typical sham conversion to Calvinism. (If he had "converted" to the official Orthodox Church, the Tsar would have been on his case. Karl Marx's father made a sham conversion to Lutheranism after Trier fell to Prussia at the Congress of Vienna in 1815, so that the Marx family could act as masters to the local Christians, most of whom were Catholics).

' Bloch's wealth was so enormous that he was able to found entire colonies of Russian Jews in Argentina; at the First Hague Conference, however, he met Theodor Herzl, the founder of Zionism, who reported on the conference for the Viennese "Neue Freie Presse". This elegant Jewish daily newspaper had the greatest influence in Austria-Hungary and was the exact opposite of the Jewish

New York Times in terms of power, prestige and influence. From then on, Bloch diverted his enormous wealth to Jewish settlement in Palestine, where he became the Rothschilds' most important financial ally^{136a}.

It was in The Hague that Herzl initiated Bloch into the secret Jewish planning to prepare for the kind of global war that was then unleashed by England in 1914. This explains why the Rothschilds were unwilling to open a new business house in Germany after the Frankfurt branch of the family had ceased to exist, despite Kaiser Wilhelm II's approval. Herzl said to Bloch: "The nations will afterwards be divided into two hostile groups: the arbiter states (the later founders of the League of Nations) and the outlaw states (the defeated Central Powers of 1918)."¹³⁷ Although Herzl died in 1904 and did not live to see all this come to pass, his 1899 communication to Bloch was not a memorable prophecy, but rather the sober revelation of a program that had been in effect since the Basel World Zionist Congress.

Herzl boasted at his meeting with Bloch that he was on intimate terms with the Grand Duke of Baden, the uncle of Kaiser Wilhelm II. In order not to be outdone, Bloch rashly promised to arrange a meeting between Herzl and the personally very pious Tsar Nicholas II, a meeting that in reality even Bloch's enormous wealth could not bring about. Although Bloch had successfully used the Calvinist façade in his dealings with the Romanov tsars, he proudly declared in his will: "I have been a Jew all my life and die a Jew." ¹³⁸

Bloch left money for a "War and Peace Museum" in Lucerne/Switzerland, and this was inaugurated on June 7, 1902. The speaker at this ceremony was Dr. Alfred Fried (1864-1922), a Jewish winner of the Nobel Peace Prize and the main figure of the German Peace Society, which later undertook an extensive campaign against the German defence effort during the First World War.

Two opponents of Imperial Germany:
Alfred Fried and Maximilian Harden

Singer compared Fried's fight against Germany to that of the Semite Hannibal against the Romans in antiquity, although Fried was a fiery Jewish agitator but possessed none of Hannibal's generalship^{14^}. In his capacity as an editor in Berlin (from 1888), Fried published the work "Die Waffen nieder!" ¹⁴² by Bertha von Suttner-Kinsky, a Czech agitator against German military preparedness and also later winner of the Nobel Peace Prize. Fried also promoted the anti-militarist paintings of the Russian artist Vasily Vereshchagin, including a subversive one depicting the horrors of the Russian siege of Turkish Plevna/Bulgaria in 1877, with a Tsar Liberator Alexander II, grinning in the background. Fried first saw Bloch at the Hague Conference in 1899, where he

also met Andrew Carnegie, a hypocritical American plutocratic evil-doer who had made his millions of dollars in the international arms trade and was seeking to burnish his image by donating a relatively small sum to the construction of the Hague Peace Palace⁴⁴.

From his secure Swiss base, Fried exported hundreds of thousands of copies of his magazine *Friedenswarte* (Peace Watch) during the First World War, which seethed with Marxist propaganda against the German middle and upper classes and was described by Singer as a "worthy comrade of the >Future< of his friend Maximilian Harden"¹⁴⁵. The Jew Harden (Witkowski) - like another Jewish troublemaking agitator in 1840s Germany, Stephen Born (Buttermilch) - was from Posen, and just like Born, he was a notorious liar who tried to set Germany on fire from one end to the other by using every kind of filthy slanderous propaganda. Ignoring the fact that the Babylonian Talmud extols homosexuality as a virtue (unlike the Bible, where homosexuals are called dogs), Harden implied without any substantiation by facts that Kaiser Wilhelm II was a homosexual and that he, Harden, was frightened by the thought. During the 1890s, Harden even poked his nose into the secrets of old Prince Bismarck - in the course of his, Harden's, campaign to destroy the Hohenzollern monarchy and spark a violent, senseless revolution in the prosperous and powerful German Empire. No wonder both Fried and Harden were praised to the skies by Dr. Isidor Singer, the wealthy and radical Jewish Marxist and prophet of permanent Jewish world domination and the extinction of traditional Christianity^{TM6}.

Before he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1911 together with the radical Dutch Jew Michael Asser (1838-1917), Fried had published various books describing the - predominantly Jewish - efforts to thwart the nationalist aspirations of individual European nations. Shortly before his death, Fried published his "War Diary"¹⁴⁷, which described in detail the full extent of his subversive activities against Germany during the First World War. Fried celebrated the efforts of the fiery Polish Jew Rosa Luxemburg to destroy the German Empire during the war - Rosa Luxemburg, a foreign female fury who Easton Rothwell, once director of the Hoover Library, described in his book¹⁴⁸ as a woman who would almost certainly have been murdered or executed in any other country, as she was during the Red Uprising in Berlin in 1919. It was precisely these anti-German Jewish troublemakers of the World War I period, such as Rosa Luxemburg, Kurt Eisner, Ernst Toller, Kurt Tucholsky and Alfred Fried, each of whom intended to destroy Christianity, capitalism and nationalism in Germany - a goal that was almost achieved in the decade and a half from 1918 to 1933 - that Dr. Isidor Singer and the left-leaning American Federal Council of Churches, for they saw in such efforts - as in those of Bolshevism in Russia and Zionism in Palestine - the model for the ultimate

destruction of conservative and nationalist Christian elements in the United States¹⁴⁹.

Oscar Strauss, President of the New York Peace Society

Singer also gave special praise to another German Jew, Oscar Strauss, who had emigrated from Bavaria to the USA. Strauss' great-great-grandfather had been the leader of the French Jewish Sanhedrin in its campaign to overthrow the Bourbon dynasty in France - an effort which, with the support of Masonic-Illuminati-Jacobin elements, came to full fruition in 1792, the year before the executions of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette. (The definitive scientific proof that the Jacobins were not proletarians at all, but bourgeois in disguise, was provided by Brinton¹⁵⁰). Strauss was the first president of the New York Peace Society. After his term of office, he brought Andrew Carnegie into this office for a few years, while he himself was occupied with appropriating for his own purposes a considerable portion of the philanthropic fund money that came from Carnegie's immense wealth. He then replaced Carnegie for a second long term as President of the Peace Society^{^^}

Strauss' memoirs of his career¹⁵² begin proudly: "I am a Hebrew. " His relatives were among the 71 Jewish personalities summoned to Paris by Emperor Napoleon I in 1807. Their opposition to his rule led to a final break in the same year, and Napoleon revoked the equality granted to French Jews by the subversive radicals of 1791. The Jews returned the favor by summoning their cousins in the Vilnius "womb of European Jewry" to carry off all the huge stocks of essential supplies that Napoleon had accumulated in Smolensk during the summer of 1812. Without this gigantic theft - Napoleon's retreat from Moscow was quite successful until he reached the Smolensk area - Napoleon's pan-European army would still have been in good condition when it retreated to East Prussia, and the Rothschilds in their alliance with England would not have been able to overthrow Napoleon's rule. Because of the weakness of the retreating French troops due to unnecessary starvation, the cruelty of the Jewish partisans towards them reached a ferocity and brutality not seen in Europe since the days of Attila the Hun^{^^}

Lazarus Strauss, Oscar's father, grew up in Bavaria, where his parents had fled after Napoleon began his anti-Jewish policy in France in 1807. Lazarus came to Bavaria with an enormous fortune in gold and jewels that had previously belonged to murdered French aristocrats. This enabled him to buy up many of the large Bavarian estates and become the largest grain wholesaler in the Wittelsbach kingdom overnight. From the very beginning, Lazarus worked hard to destroy the Wittelsbachs and was at the forefront of the attempt to

abolish the Bavarian monarchy during the revolution of 1848. After the failure of violent Marxism and other Jewish revolutionary efforts in Germany in 1849, Lazarus began to liquidate his property in Germany in preparation for his move to the United States. Oscar was born in 1850 in the midst of these activities, and the entire Strauss family settled in New York City in 1852. Singer notes in his book that Lazarus Strauss began to increase his fortune in the United States through the jewelry trade, "as the ancestors of the Guggenheims, Seligmans, Sterns, and most other families of our country's contemporary Jewish aristocracy had done" 154.

Strauss mission in the Ottoman Empire

The Strauss family's wealth increased rapidly while Oscar, who was appointed agent of the House of Rothschild, was still a young man. After the largely Jewish Paris Commune failed to destroy the French Third Republic (but the Jew Gambetta was able to prolong the hopeless Franco-Prussian War so that the House of Rothschild could put the new French regime in a permanent financial stranglehold), world Jewry focused on destroying the Romanov Tsardom in order to gain Russia instead of France as a base for revolutionary world conquest. A century of savage Jewish effort had fallen just short of total success in France; now that total success was to be achieved in Russia within fifty years. Jewish subversive campaigns in Russia quickly introduced Jewry in England, Germany, France and America to the messianic Khazar Jewish nationalism that had long preceded the political Jewish nationalism of Theodor Herzl. Unlike Herzl, this Khazarian nationalism was determined to possess only Arab Palestine and no other territory as a permanent basis for a Jewish state of its own, which was to exist in parallel with the Goyim enslaved under the Jewish yoke in other countries.

Arab Palestine in those days was within the Ottoman Empire, and for this reason Oscar Strauss, at the age of thirty-six, persuaded US President Grover Cleveland to appoint him American envoy to Constantinople in 1886¹⁵⁵. Cleveland was less enthusiastic about the Jews than his fellow Democrat Woody Wilson, and it took a mighty effort by the respected and corrupt left-wing Congregationalist minister Henry Ward Beecher (whose sister had written the pre-Civil War propaganda novel *Uncle Tom's Cabin*) to push through Strauss's appointment as the top US diplomat in the Turkish Empire⁶.

Strauss stayed in London on the trip to Turkey for crucial secret conferences with Baron Alfred Rothschild, the political leader of English Jewry since the death of Benjamin Disraeli five years earlier⁵⁷. Hardly established in Constantinople, the orthodox Jew Strauss insisted on presiding over the

graduation ceremony at Robert College, which had been founded by American missionaries for young Greek, Bulgarian and Armenian Christians¹⁵⁸. No sooner had he thus asserted his Jewish authority over the American Christians in Turkey than Strauss hurried to Jerusalem, where he took advantage of the fact that "the Ottoman government was generally friendly to the Jews."¹⁵⁹ This fact is not surprising when one remembers that for centuries the Jews had helped the Turks to keep the Balkan... Christians politically and militarily, and that the Turks and the Jewish Khazars were racial enemies. The Khazars, whose mother tongue is a Turkic dialect still spoken today by strict Jewish believers in Eastern Europe, make up about 90 percent of the racial origin of modern Jewry, while the remaining 10 percent are of Semitic descent¹⁶⁰. The earlier friendship between Turks and Arabs evaporated after Mehemet Ali of Egypt attempted to liberate the lands of the Arab Fertile Crescent in the 1830s; and when - fifty years later - the Turks realized that the Jews were planning to inflict a great injustice on the Arabs, to depopulate some of their lands, to split the Arab world into two separate parts right at its center in Palestine, the rich American and European Jew became persona grata in the Ottoman Empire more than ever.

Oscar Strauss was already keen to steal Palestine from the Arabs many years before he met Theodor Herzl, the founder and leader of modern Zionism, for the first time in Vienna. No sooner had the two met than they formed a political alliance, and Strauss promised to dedicate the rest of his life to the promotion of world Zionism¹⁶¹. Although Strauss never gained the kind of influence with President Teddy Roosevelt that Bernard Baruch had with President Woody Wilson, Strauss successfully entered Teddy's cabinet in 1906 and became U.S. Secretary of Commerce and Labor¹⁶². He retained his office until 1919 as president of a left-leaning New York

Peace Society, which was supposedly pacifist, but Strauss was nevertheless a rabid supporter of the war from 1914 under Wilson and led a lavishly financed public campaign against "German militaristic culture"¹⁶³. In his book, Singer admired this kind of Jewish duplicity without bounds and proudly insisted that the scoundrel Oscar Strauss "represents the vitalistic high point of the Jewish people"¹⁶⁴.

Wilson and the Jewish goals

It was the Texas Jew Edward Mandeli House who first proclaimed¹⁶⁵ that his own political creation, Woody Wilson, should impose a collectivist world state on the whole of humanity. The first successful step towards this would be the creation of a League of Nations under Wilson's auspices. This particular project, as far as the US was concerned, was thwarted once and for all in the

1920 presidential election, the last election in which both the Democratic and Republican candidates faced a foreign policy issue to a supposedly free, in reality oppressed electorate. Although Jewish Bolshevism aimed directly at a world dictatorship localized in Moscow and only began to accept the idea of the League of Nations as a second-best step after Hitler's accession to power in 1933 under the Jewish foreign commissar Litvinov-Finkelstein (a former London corset salesman), world Zionism immediately seized on the idea of an American-based League of Nations as an extremely useful instrument for its plan of Jewish territorial aggrandizement at the expense of the Arabs.

Singer was unwilling to accept the American public's 1920 verdict against the League of Nations. He claimed that the Jews - born master propagandists of the world because of their deviousness, ambition, and unlimited capacity to lie - had a sacred duty to convert the mindless American goyim to swallow the League of Nations at the expense of the idea of American national sovereignty. With this in mind, he declared that "our schools of theology must become schools of prophets"¹⁶⁶. The main point of Singer's book would be missed if one imagined that he had in mind only rabbinical schools, for it was in fact his intention to align organized American Christianity intellectually and emotionally-both cognitively and emotionally-with Judaism. This openly proclaimed goal was fully achieved within a generation of the first publication of Dr. Singer's seminal book in 1924.

Singer openly declared that he, like most Jews, remained one hundred percent in agreement with the Wilsonian policy of 1913-1919, which had been so clearly defeated in 1920. He added that "the hour is truly dark" and that "we need a Napoleon of peace"¹⁶⁷. Had Singer lived long enough for Frank Roosevelt to finally bring about the Japanese retaliatory attack against Pearl Harbor and thus initiate the official American foreign policy of perpetual war for perpetual peace, Singer would probably have called Frank Roosevelt the Napoleon of peace, and he would certainly have agreed with the judgment of the American left-leaning Protestant theologian Reinhold Niebuhr that FDR had truly been Jehovah's favorite instrument of choice.

Singer's messianic zeal was not dampened in 1920 by the overwhelming rejection of global foolishness by the U.S. electorate, and he hailed with self-righteous fervor "America, the future arbiter of the world."¹⁶⁸ Singer vilified average American Christians for lacking Jewish zeal, and he claimed that the Christian world could only benefit from "a Jewish interpretation of the Gospel."¹⁶⁹ Since the main thrust of Jesus' mission was directed against the grandiloquent master-race pretensions of a corrupt organized world Jewry, Singer's demand was the same as asking that Joseph Stalin be made the supreme arbiter in the Vatican.

The Jews may always replace their traditional hatred and vilification of Jesus

with condescending ridicule, minimizing his role to that of a petty leftist social worker; however, in the Jewish holy of holies, the Babylonian Talmud of 400 AD (soon to be used to proselytize the savage Khazars), the only impression one gets of Jesus is that he was some crazy pimp and seducer. The fact that Singer's distorted platform for the future of organized Christianity was soon accepted by the majority of the leading figures of institutionalized American Christianity says it all-especially with regard to the tenets of these supposed guardians of the true faith. Any one of them at the crucifixion would have been happy to thrust a spear into the side of that Jesus who failed to foresee the surprising discovery of the United States that money was, is, and always will be not Mammon - as Jesus had proclaimed - but the true Almighty God. (One thinks of Rudyard Kipling's amusement at an Episcopal Church service in Chicago when the priest fervently proclaimed, "I tell you, God doesn't do business that way" 170!)

Christianity without Jesus?

Rosalie Slater and Verna Hall¹⁷¹ have demonstrated with scholarly certainty that there was a total difference between the so-called American Revolution of 1776 and the Great French Revolution of 1789 in that the former was merely a reactionary defense of existing rights usurped by London mercantilists after 1763, while the latter was an attempt to completely sub-¹⁷²versively overthrow traditional French society. Countless earlier books - from George Bancroft's ten volumes in the 1830s right up to the 1920s, when Singer was writing - have varied this theme in every conceivable way. And yet it all remained an unknown land for Singer: "The world ...can only be cured ...by a new religio-ethical 1789" ¹⁷² Mahan, for all his immaturity, primitiveness, arrogance and aversion to real research, was a marvel of sophistry and sophistication compared to Singer. And yet, a generation after Mahan, the latter's work was more successful than anything Mahan, in his wildest ambition, would have thought possible. (Indeed, there can be no doubt that the level of American public opinion has sunk faster and faster with each decade since the end of the Civil War in 1865).

Singer went on to say that we need a world full of "one God" churches. In his attack on the concept of the Trinity, Singer ignored the fact that both Old Testament Judaism and Talmudic Judaism exhibit polytheistic traits¹⁷³ ³ Singer claims that "centuries before Luther, Christianity had ceased to be Christian (sic!)"TM He believes that Jesus is superfluous to Christianity because the Jews knew "700 years before Christ" that people did not need a mediator between themselves and God. According to Singer, not the cross, but the Masonic

"rainbow should be the symbol of the world religion of the future "175. In Singer's view, there could be no universal prayer if it did not avoid any reference to Jesus

Two prominent American Jews, Israel Zangwill (a leading plutocratic evildoer) and Solomon Rosenbloom (president of the Hebrew Institute of Pittsburgh), wrote erudite epilogues that Singer included in his book along with Ed Filene's essay. The main thrust of Singer's message, however, emerged with sufficient clarity from his own text. It could be understood to mean that traditional American Christianity of the Pilgrim Fathers was to perish because it was as encrusted and obsolete as the dinosaurs, while Master Race Judaism (which had caused suffering, fear and bloodshed around the globe for more than 2500 years) was as fresh and pristine as ever and all mankind was to turn to it as their model forever.

The USA - a "Christian nation"?

Since Singer's dreadful medicine was eagerly swallowed by the majority of the leaders of American organized Christianity within a few decades, one need not be surprised at the rapid decline and decay of the United States, which took place even though no foreign power had wanted to harm the United States since the end of the Civil War or had voluntarily embarked on a policy with such a goal. (The fact that there was resistance to unprovoked American military aggression in some parts of the world is another matter). The stupidity and greed of the American goyim together with the huge Jewish population of the USA - the largest ever in any country - provide not only a sufficient but an overwhelming explanation of American self-destruction. To use the language of the New Testament parable, one would have to say that in the United States the seed has fallen on bare rock in the socio-economic and political spheres. There is no country in the Western world in the late 20th century where the people understand less about traditional Christianity - and yet it was not until 1892 (the 400th anniversary of Columbus' discovery) that the US Supreme Court officially declared in its famous obiter dicta that the US was a Christian nation. What C. S. Lewis said about England in his farewell address at Cambridge University in 1955, that it lived in the post-Christian era after the Rothschilds and Disraelis¹⁷⁷ came to power, can be applied equally to the USA after Woody Wilson and Bernard Baruch came to power.

The Marxist-Leninist nonsense about the equality of the human races (with the exception of the alleged superiority of the Jewish master race, which Singer calls the most "aristo-democratic" race in human history¹⁷⁸) was refuted in advance by Joseph Artbur de Gobineau (1816- 1882). In his great work¹⁷⁹ he

explained how the Nordic-Germanic-Celtic peoples rejuvenated Europe after the ethical, moral and racial suicide of the once racially Nordic ancient Egyptians, Hittites, Trojans, Greeks and Romans and the genocide of the Jews against the ancient Nordic Philistines. Gobineau's work became known immediately in Germany, but in England and the USA it only became known 180 years after the English had started the first of their :Two Greatest Race Crimes, the wars of aggression against Germany in 1914 and 1939.

Lord Halifax,
a product of the Anglo-Saxon race myth

Had relatively provincial people like A. T. Mahan, Teddy Roosevelt, Woody Wilson and Frank Roosevelt absorbed Gobineau's ideas before the outbreak of global madness that erupted after Sir Edward Grey unleashed World War I, perhaps the limited, snobbish and false myth of the "Anglo-Saxon race" would have been dropped in time to avert the senselessly destructive, racially suicidal European warfare of the 20th century that so remarkably energized the ranks of world Jewry, whether Jewish-Bolshevik or Jewish-Zionist. It was this that so remarkably galvanized the ranks of world Jewry, whether Jewish-Bolshevik or Jewish-Zionist.

Kaiser Wilhelm II called the highly intelligent son of a British admiral, Houston Stewart Chamberlain 181, the best worker for reason and peace among the European nations, and he counted on Chamberlain to awaken the English-speaking world to the realities of history - but Wilhelm II, the Hohenzollern favorite grandson of Queen Victoria of England, overestimated the intellectual receptivity of England and America.

During a visit to Berchtesgaden in mid-November 1937 by the powerful Lord Halifax, Hitler realized that the man who was to become British Foreign Secretary within three months was not only sympathetic to sensible German revisionist solutions in Austria, Czechoslovakia and Danzig, but that Halifax also understood in a broader sense the remarkable kinship among the Germanic-Celtic peoples of Europe. The fact is, however, that Hitler - not unlike Mahatma Gandhi six years earlier - was only deceived by the overly pious High Church Anglican Halifax, who in the course of his maiden speech in the House of Commons in 1910 contemptuously called the Egyptians enslaved by England "Negroes", thus making it obvious that he suffered from all the self-deceptions of the legend of so-called Anglo-Saxon racial superiority.

Halifax had received an A in history at Oxford, but as with the later Oxford history professor Hugh Trevor-Roper, Halifax's main subject was English religious history, with particular emphasis on the 17th century and its turbulent

religious civil wars^{^^}. That Halifax, like his cousin Edward Grey, did not really understand German history - nor the history of other countries on the European continent - is best illustrated by his statement in March 1938 to the astonished German ambassador Joachim v. Ribbentrop that the reunification of Austria with the rest of Germany (which had been one state for over a thousand years until 1866) would be similar to Belgium joining England. This is a classic example of the justification for Spengler's complaint that many historians are incapable of making proper use of the important tool of analogy.

Halifax, after leaving Oxford, excelled mainly at hunts, and like the Habsburg Archduke Franz Ferdinand until his assassination by Serbian terrorists, Halifax was credited by his official biographer Lord Birkenhead with the single-handed killing of over 50,000 game animals on his beloved hunts, despite his withered right arm and lung weakness, from which all his brothers had died. This passion for hunting left him little energy to keep up with important historical developments, and neither Gandhi in 1931 nor Hitler in 1937 - both of whom negotiated in good faith - suspected that Halifax was a pathological liar who never spoke or negotiated with a foreigner in candor.

Hitler stated in 1938 and 1939 that Sir Nevil Henderson, Halifax's ambassador to Germany, was a reasonable and intelligent man who fully realized the absolute and senseless insanity of a second murderous conflict between the Germanic-Celtic cousins England and Germany. What Hitler did not know, however, was that Halifax despised and ignored his own ambassador, but cleverly gave Hitler the impression that he trusted him and listened to him. The world did not fall apart in 1945 because Hitler was too moderate and too decent - an argument I often heard during my historical lecture tour of Europe in 1964 - but because the leaders in America and England were too corrupt and too stupid.

The teachings of Count Gobineau

Like Henri Beyle Stendhal and Edouard Drumont (the great expert on Judaism who died of a broken heart in 1917 during the senseless Franco-German massacre of the First World War), Gobineau was a prominent French journalist. After the election of Louis Napoleon as French president (1848), Gobineau joined the French diplomatic service. He was known to the French-reading aristocrats in the Louisiana Confederate States of America¹⁸³ during the American Civil War of 1861-1865, and they found justification for their paternalistic civilizing program for the American Negro in Gobineau's conviction that "The Teutons are the highest of all the branches of the Aryan master race." ¹⁸⁴

In France in Gobineau's day, it was a commonplace that the more Teutonic blood you had, the higher up the social ladder you were. After all, France was named after the Germanic Franks. These ideas were shared in Louisiana, where the upper class was predominantly French-until after the defeat of the South in 1865.

So although Gobineau was known early on in one region of the US, the great French racial anthropologist was unknown to people like Mahan, the two Roosevelts and Wilson, who maintained their outmoded allegiance to the unscientific Anglo-Saxon racial myth. No wonder these same people became easy prey to the messianic propaganda of American Jewry, which knew when to cajole and when to scold, when to use the carrot and when the stick. Baroch's seizure of power over Wilson's mind - and Wilson's over Frank Roosevelt's mind - would not have been so easy had both Wilson and Roosevelt been truly educated men. Both were far more ignorant than the world feared until posthumous investigations revealed their moral, ethical, emotional and intellectual shortcomings.

Just as Admiral Horthy, the regent of Hungary, who many educated Hungarians said would not have made a decent mayor of a small Hungarian town, and who then became easy prey in World War II to the mendacious operations of Ernst v. Weizsäcker and other members of the secret German treasonous elite, neither Woody Wilson nor Frank Roosevelt were of the real stuff that presidents are made of, and neither would have been nominated for the presidency but for the corruption of the American convention system that had been in place since 1840^

It should come as no surprise that a sharp-eyed German artistic genius and intellectual like Richard Wagner (1813-1883)¹⁸⁶ - mindful of the mischief that petty dynastic politics and pluto-aristocratic disloyalty to German interests had wrought in the ranks of modern German nationalists - that Wagner thus personally tracked down Gobineau, the brilliant French apostle of modern scientific racial anthropology, in Paris and cultivated an acquaintance with him. Both Gobineau and Wagner were personally courageous enough to publicly denounce world Jewry as the main obstacle to the survival of the Celtic and Germanic peoples in the modern age, in which it so often seemed that money alone ruled the minds and hearts of men.

Ingenuous personalities have often been accused of being brutal when they criticized world Jewry - usually at considerable personal risk - men such as Gobineau, Drumont, Wagner and Heinrich von Treitschke (1834-1896). According to Leopold von Ranke, Treitschke¹⁸⁷ was the greatest of all German historians of the 19th century - a century that had more to offer in terms of outstanding achievements in German historiography and historical syntheses than any year before or since.

Treitschke began his career as a liberal who wanted the people - not Bismarck - to unite Germany, and he always remained a scientist of the greatest flexibility and objectivity. His comments on the corruption of modern Germany by world Jewry were more valuable for scientific truth than the criticism of ten thousand anti-Jewish demagogues. That such geniuses as Treitschke were guilty of brutalizing a small minority must be described as the most blatant distortion of all time, for in Europe between Waterloo (1815) and Hitler's rise to power (1933) it was Khazarian Jewry with its Albigensian-like treasure of gold - and not ordinary Europeans like the aforementioned French and Germans - that possessed the real means of power and used that power with single-minded intolerance. It was during the years before the publication of Treitschke's book warning of the operations of world Jewry in Germany that Richard Wagner founded Germany's first Gobineau Society in the festival city of Bayreuth with the aim of preaching "Nordic superiority to the world" 188 .

It was also Wagner who introduced the brilliant English cultural historian Houston Stewart Chamberlain (1855-1927) to the profundities of Gobineau, and Chamberlain later confirmed that no single intellectual influence had shaped his own historical work more thoroughly than the courageous French genius Joseph Arthur de Gobineau. When Chamberlain first met Adolf Hitler in Bayreuth in October 1923, he quickly became what only the French can describe as *exalte*, for he knew, with his breadth of historical insight and experience, that Germany, despite the terrible crimes of Britain and the USA after 1914, would have a great future under this leader. Like Francis Neilson, who resigned from the House of Commons in 1915 and became a US citizen in the face of the brutal excesses of English imperialism, Chamberlain, thinking that England had temporarily become the slave of the Rothschilds and world Jewry, renounced the citizenship of the country where his father had been an admiral and a military hero - and became a German.

It is interesting to note that Hitler was only 34 years old and virtually unknown to the world when Chamberlain recognized his true nature and his fateful role in future world history.

Chamberlain explained his observation to Hitler directly in a few well-chosen, succinct words, adding that "you have changed the state of my soul at a stroke" 189

Fight to restrict immigration in the USA

Incidentally, the German intellectual influence in American higher education

was strong during the two generations between the bloody American Civil War of 1861-1865 and the bloody European Civil War of 1914-1918 known as World War I. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), where I was teaching in 1949 when I took a leave of absence to organize, with H. F. Peters, the American Institute of the University of Munich (a revival of the old Teddy Roosevelt-era academic ■ exchange program between Harvard and Munich), this MIT was then the most prestigious institution of higher learning in the United States-more so than Harvard, which had lagged behind Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland, in some phases of graduate education. MIT President General F. A. Walker was the one who published his famous essay "Restriction of Immigration "i90 in 1896. Walker was proud to be a loyal disciple of Gobineau, even before the latter's work had appeared in English, and in his essay he lashed out against the so-called New Immigration, which consisted mainly of Jews, southern Italians and Slavs. He proclaimed the need to "raise the American wage level ... from the countries of Eastern and Southern Europe "19^ He particularly opposed the "Russian Jews (Khazar Jews) " and some others who "have none of the ideas and skills that enable a man to tackle the problem of self-care and self-government quickly and easily - as those whose ancestors came together under the oak trees of old Germany to make laws and elect chieftains"^^

Walker's courageous pioneering essay, coming from so intellectually high a source, created its own momentum and led twenty-eight years later to the enlightened and comprehensive Johnson Immigration Act of 1924. Support for this law was so strong that Frank Roosevelt dared not seek its repeal during his presidency, yet he violated it in his usual secretly conspiratorial and criminal manner. The law closed the door to most of the kinds of immigration that General Walker had opposed in his essay. The law followed his advice and favored Scandinavia, Germany, England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales.

Had this wise immigration law not later been violated by Frank Roosevelt and completely repealed by his successors, the subsequent rapid decline of the USA would either not have occurred or would have happened at a much slower pace. Needless to say, world Jewry celebrated another Purim victory when the Johnson Act of 1924 was repealed. The Jews were the first to realize that with the passage of the 1965 Immigration Act, the last obstacle to their permanent destruction of the traditional United States had fallen.

American criticism of Judaism

Gobineau's influence in America can also be clearly seen in the anthropological-biological masterpiece of Dr. Charles Davenport¹⁹³, in the

brilliant warning of Madison Grant¹⁹⁴ against racial pollution, but above all in the work of the prolific and brilliant Harvard scientist Lothrop Stoddard¹⁹⁵. Madison Grant also performed an important service by destroying the scientific reputation of the left-wing Jewish racial anthropologist Franz Boas, who had managed to attract some naïve and gullible followers despite-or perhaps because of-hating the white race in every way. Men like Grant and Stoddard rejoiced when they saw the Johnson Act pass the US Senate in 1924 with the help of President Coolidge, and yet they were fighting a losing battle. World Jewry, alerted to their open challenge, finally succeeded in smearing all of these men, throwing mud at them - just as they had used coercion and economic duress to silence criticism of Judaism by the once powerful industrial leader Henry Ford Sr. who watched impotently as his daughter-in-law Eleanor Ford transferred his entire fortune devoted to philanthropy to the Jewish-controlled Ford Foundation, thereby turning it over to world Jewry. This foundation was headed in the 1970s by Shephard Stone, a Jewish former editor of the New York Times and former American Public Affairs Commissioner in enslaved West Germany after 1945, a man who, after the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950, told a group of American professors in Munich that he would vouch with his reputation and even his life that there would never, ever be serious trouble between the USA and the USSR.

The antagonism of world Jewry - Zionist, Bolshevik, or both - was too much for the brave and decent American scientists who hoped their knowledge would be of lasting benefit to the preservation and strengthening of their country. World Jewry, which in the 20th century had destroyed the Romanov Russian Empire, destroyed the German Hohenzollern Empire and attacked the entire world of Islam with its chauvinistic and irrational "modern Israel", this world Jewry had decided the downfall of traditional America, and men like Walker, Davenport, Grant, Stoddard and Ford could not change that. Only a wise and decent leader of the stature of Bob LaFollette could have reversed the trend started by powerful US Jews, but LaFollette's great attempt of 1912¹⁹⁶ - before the unnecessary catastrophe of World War I - was thwarted by the dishonor and ambition of Teddy Roosevelt. The oppressed American public was soaked in the lies of the Jewish mass media and was not consulted on this miserable event.

Each new success strengthened the powerful Jewish leaders in the United States in their determination never to allow the American people, who had been unsuccessful in their quest for social and individual freedom since the 17th century, to achieve real freedom of any kind. World Jewry had always ruled through secret conspiratorial activities, loving the American system of plutocratic oligarchy inherited from their predatory non-Jewish predecessors, and thought nothing of experimenting with LaFollette's progressive doctrine of liberty, which the Jews had never understood and always despised. Since the

very beginning of the modern Illuminati and Freemason movements in the 18th century, world Jewry has been the most important of the Jewish religions. Since the very beginning of the modern Illuminati and Freemason movements in the 18th century, world Jewry has always regarded the political emancipation of the Jews in various countries as only a first step on the road to total Jewish dictatorial power over those countries. The continuation of their successes - except for the brief Hitlerian interlude 1933-1945 in Germany and 1939-1945 in Europe - has only strengthened the Jews in their opinion, that they were on the right track to their ultimate goal of a world dictatorship over Goyim slaves to be abused, exploited and otherwise mistreated by the Khazar Jewish master race.

Madison Grant against the alienation of the USA

Madison Grant received his Bachelor of Arts degree from Yale University in 1890 and his law degree from Columbia University. An independent man by virtue of family fortune, he was a lifelong hunter, woodsman, explorer and conservationist. He was the founder of the later highly respected New York Zoological Society and the Bronx Zoo, which in recent decades was second only to the zoological gardens in San Diego, California. Because he dared to defy the criminal ambition of American Jewry, the Jewish New York Times published a spiteful and sarcastic obituary on his death in 1937 - just as the Jewish Temps in Paris had published a sordid obituary on the death of the courageous and brilliant Edouard Drumont twenty years earlier, in 1917. As far as the mass media of the West was concerned, the mighty Jew was everywhere, lashing out mercilessly at any honest and courageous criticism. He also enjoyed slandering these critics even more unobjectionably after their deaths - a process known as "kicking the dead lion".

Hjalmar Horace Greeley Schacht was also guilty of this in his book "Abrechnung mit Hitler" 197, published in Germany in 1948. Schacht had easy access to Hitler for fourteen years, from 1931 to 1945, and spent many hours with him. In his last book 198, the same Schacht had the utter gall to marvel at the fact that the second generation of post-war German youth hated National Socialism and traditional patriotism in equal measure, and to claim that he belatedly wished to revise their views. Above all, he particularly wanted to demonstrate the falsity of the evil legend of the six million Jews allegedly killed on Hitler's orders - a claim that Schacht himself had confirmed in his 1948 book.

Madison Grant's book of 1916/1919 was read with sympathy in the United States by Calvin Coolidge, who sat in the White House from 1923 to 1929, from

the death of Harding to the inauguration of Hoover. Grant's book contained the observation that "the old-style man is being driven out of many rural districts ... just as he is literally being driven from the streets of New York by swarms of Polish Jews. "200 Grant considered the passage of the selective Johnson Immigration Law of 1924 his personal victory, even though General Walker of MIT had led the last concerted push in favor of the much-needed legislation, and Grant was also proud - not dismayed - when the U.S. Jewish media denounced the new law as a victory for racism after it passed Congress. Grant knew full well that every man worth his salt has been a racist - which does not mean, of course, that every racist or every patriot is necessarily a good man. The sad fact remains that during the era of the rising Jewish tide in the United States, the victories of normal and sane Northern racists like Henry Ford and Madison Grant have always been ephemeral, while the triumphs of wealthy American Jewry - with the sole exception of 1920, when the American electorate defeated Wilson's League of Nations - have been lasting victories, laying the groundwork for further progress in the old Jewish dream of permanent world domination.

The decline of America's Christian churches

While Alfred T. Mahan agreed with General Walker that the Jews threatened the survival of the United States and that immigration should be restricted at the expense of the Jews, Mahan's main preoccupation was always the coming age of worldwide American naval supremacy and worldwide American economic and political imperialism at the expense of the so-called lesser races and in favor of the legendary Anglo-Saxon race²⁰⁰⁸. Mahan's chauvinistic propaganda was crude, but not half as crude as the evil messianic nonsense of Isidore Singer so eagerly swallowed by the powerful and leftist American Federal Council of Churches, which around 1930 represented nothing more than a front against traditional Christian ideas in the interests of the machinations and aspirations of world Jewry.

This servility of the Protestant establishment towards Judaism is to blame for the dissolution of the old American churches during the 1930s, including the most prestigious (and to which most US presidents belonged), the Presbyterian Church USA. The new Orthodox Presbyterian Church rejected this servile anti-Christian Judaism of the mainline church and took the intellectual cream of the American Presbyterian clergy with it when it left. The difficulty here was that by the 1930s the American masses had been so thoroughly indoctrinated by the

Jewish media (including Hollywood) with Jewish religious ideas and Jewish nonsense about Jesus that the new Orthodox Presbyterian Church - however prolific it was in publishing learned theological treatises, which remained unknown to the American masses - became an organization with many leaders and few followers, while the general church attendance of Americans - whose ancestors had eagerly awaited the Sunday four-hour sermons of Presbyterian and Congregationalist pastors - declined almost overnight with astonishing and frightening rapidity. This was in complete contrast to the increase in church attendance in Germany after Hitler's rise in 1933 - a phenomenon that led Hans Grimm to compare Hitler to Martin Luther as a promoter of the revival of German Christian religious consciousness²⁰¹.

The 20th century

begins under the sign of the imperialism of the great powers

Mahan rejoiced over large new armaments expenditures by the USA from 1898 onwards; In 1911, however, when the American navy was suddenly outstripped by the German fleet despite its rapid growth, Mahan coined the Anglophile formula of a "navy that is second to none, except the British"²⁰². Now the brilliant German naval strategist Admiral Tirpitz had made it sufficiently clear that Germany - even though its industrial production was much greater than England's - had no intention of overtaking the British fleet, that Germany - even though its industrial output was much greater than England's - had no intention of overtaking the British fleet, and that the sole purpose of the German fleet was to make Germany a more attractive future ally for England (as advocated by the late Cecil Rhodes and expressed in the Rhodes Trust Oxford University scholarship policy for German students). Mahan, however, indulged in the perverse, nonsensical notion that Germany secretly aspired to the most powerful of navies as part of a thinly veiled program of future German world conquest.

Worldwide British imperialism was omnipresent and influenced the foreign policy of all major states. That Germany, like England, France and the USA, continued to have imperialist intentions was clear from the first major work²⁰³ by the Hamburg professor of contemporary history, Fritz Fischer. Unfortunately, Fischer turned away from historical revisionism in the course of the 1950s, along with virtually all his professional colleagues in West Germany, whose foremost ambition became to please corrupt, imperialist official America rather than the muse Klio, with her earnest and rigorous claim to serve historical truth²⁰⁴. Fischer was obviously too subservient to the tyrannical Anglo-American occupying power, to point out that books of the kind of his, but with

the theme of secret American and British imperialist intentions, would reveal far more, and that his own work - however sociologically significant and fascinating in some details - has nothing to do with the weighty question of responsibility for the First World War. The main responsibility of the British Foreign Secretary, Sir Edward Grey, for the First World War had already been convincingly and conclusively demonstrated in the 1920s by Hermann Lutz in Germany and Georges Demartial in France.

The threat of aggression against the German Reich

When the leading German historian of the modern era in this century, Karl Lamprecht²⁰⁵ (1856-1915), visited the USA in 1904 - after the conclusion of the British-French entente cordiale - to accept an honorary degree as a historian, to travel throughout the USA and to lecture at Columbia University, he was surprised by the Anglomania and Germanophobia he encountered on his travels through the country and especially in the financially and industrially dominant northeastern USA. Lamprecht sadly but accurately predicted that Anglo-American military aggression against Germany was likely, if not certain, with Russia, Japan and France being mere tools of the Anglo-American alliance. The only consolation that the great mind of Lamprecht - now regarded in the United States as the father of the new American historiographical school, New History - could offer his fellow Germans was the advice to prepare for a defensive war of long duration (advice that was not heeded in Germany) in the hope that Germany could outlast its opponents despite their vast numerical superiority, as Frederick the Great had done for Prussia in the Seven Years' War. Although the preparatory German defensive measures Lamprecht had recommended, such as the stockpiling of raw materials, were not carried out, Lamprecht's strategy would undoubtedly have proved successful had Germany remained firmly united behind Kaiser Wilhelm II throughout the First World War. Unfortunately, even before the war, the Kaiser's prestige within Germany was seriously weakened by the German-Jewish press (of which Maximilian Harden was only one notorious example), and German civil liberties and German tolerance enabled the Jews to rally the SPD (majority socialists), the USPD (minority socialists) and the Spartacus League (German-Jewish Bolsheviks), to torpedo the previously successful German war effort (which included unleashing a general strike on the eve of the decisive German offensive of March 1918 to force a negotiated peace), to eliminate the Kaiser while the war was still in progress, and to plunge all of Germany into the anarchy of civil war and riots in the style of the Jewish Paris Commune of 1871, which was used against France during the Franco-German War²⁰⁶.

Mahan shared with some other naval experts the view that Russia could have defeated the Japanese in 1904-1905 if the entire Russian fleet had been concentrated in the Baltic at the beginning of the war, instead of being divided between the Baltic, the Black Sea and the Pacific; the Japanese would thus have been deprived of the possibility of destroying each part separately. It was this purely military realization, Mahan claimed, that led him to advise concentrating the entire US battle fleet in the Pacific - but in reality this was nothing but a transparent ploy aimed at an immediate Anglo-American military alliance. The Anglo-French military agreements from 1904 onwards required France to confine itself to the Mediterranean, while England assumed sole responsibility for the defense of the French coasts on the Channel and Atlantic against Germany - a peacetime military arrangement that any child could understand tied France hand and foot to the English war cart.

Of course, an analogous one-ocean policy of the United States - with England taking over the defense of the American coasts on the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico - had to tie the United States to the British war wagon in exactly the same way, and that and nothing else was what Mahan wanted. It was outrageous, unfounded and endlessly provocative for the cheap jingoistic Mahan to pretend to the American public, on the basis of supposed expert knowledge, that Germany could come at the US in the same dirty way that the Japanese came at the Russians in 1904. Had Mahan been honest and logical - and he was neither - he should have added that such a strike by Germany against the US could only take place with the blessing and support of England, for that was the only reason why Japan attacked the Russians at England's behest in 1904.

At the time when Mahan's propaganda began to dominate everything - 1890 - the USA was the sixth strongest naval power in the world, Germany the fifth strongest. The British fleet, number one, was more than three times the size of the French fleet, number two. Russia was number three in 1890, Italy number four²⁰⁷. The huge American naval construction plan at the time of US Secretary of the Navy Benjamin Tracy was based on secret conferences between Tracy and Mahan, whereby the former was already familiar with all of Mahan's main ideas and arguments before they were published. Another important Mahan disciple was Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, who chaired the Naval Affairs Committee of the US House of Representatives in 1890. Lodge, Teddy Roosevelt's closest personal friend, wrote to Mahan in 1890 "to congratulate him."²⁰⁸ Not surprisingly, President Teddy Roosevelt's costly and crazy venture to send the US fleet around the world to make an impression on Japan was directly inspired by Mahan²⁰⁹.

Teddy became Mahan's favorite disciple because, as Duroselle nicely summed it up, "Roosevelt praised war. "2" ^ After the Peace of Portsmouth, which ended the Russo-Japanese War in 1905, Mahan and Teddy Roosevelt were both suspicious of the victorious Japanese, but they also hoped that England would start a global war by attacking Germany in the European theater first. Their attitude after 1905 was exactly the same as that of Stalin and Litvinov-Finkelstein after the European Disarmament Conference of 1932-1934, which should have met in 1920 and had been promised to mankind every year since then. No sooner had it convened than the conference was very quickly torpedoed by England and France, and the chances of a genuine European peace settlement were practically destroyed. Since a major war was now possible again, from 1934 onwards Russia - like the USA from 1905 onwards - thirsted for a conflict that would weaken Europe to such an extent that it would increase its own power. The culmination of all this nonsense was the elimination of Europe in 1945 and the perpetual massive armament and soul-killing sterile stalemate between the two barbaric superpowers, the USA and the USSR. The real culture coming from the people had been wiped out in Russia by the Jewish Bolsheviks in 1917, and the USA, with all its worship of machines, money and technical bric-a-brac, had never managed to rise to a level where it could have developed a culture of its own. In this way, there has been a permanent, bleak divorce between the life source of Western culture in Europe and the means of power monopolized in the barren outer reaches of the world. As long as no inward or outward developments succeed in destroying the power monopoly of the barbaric superpowers, there can be no rebirth for the West, only death. Fortunately, the insoluble problems in the inner of both the USA and the USSR have been multiplying in recent years in such a way that only the most fearful would not dare to predict that the shameful monopoly of power of the two will quickly come to an end - even before the dark, catastrophic and blind 20th century has come to an end. So it is the blunders of the USA and the incompetence of the USSR that are gradually reawakening hope in the West and throughout the world, despite the endless horrors these two have caused the world in recent decades21^

The Moroccan crisis of 1905

England literally pushed France into active aggression in Morocco in 1905 in violation of the Eight Powers Treaty of 1880 on the neutrality and inviolability of Morocco. This was a duplicate of the similar 1839 treaty on Belgium that had ended years of war between Belgium and the Netherlands, but in 1887 Britain encouraged Germany to violate the Belgium Treaty in the event of war because London was then at loggerheads with France and Russia overseas. In 1914, however, Grey disingenuously claimed that it was England's duty to defend the

same Belgium Treaty - a claim that was disingenuous because Belgium, under British pressure, had violated its own neutrality and held secret military staff talks with the French and English.

Germany's sole defense of Morocco's integrity led to the 1906 conference of the signatory powers in Algeci- ras, Spain, where Germany suddenly found itself completely isolated from the other signatory powers - thanks to British secret policy. The proverbial venality of Emperor Franz Joseph of Austria-Hungary and his government made it easy for Britain to separate Austria-Hungary from the German Empire at the conference. Italy, although Germany's ally, was not a problem for England, as the Italians had made secret agreements in 1900, 1902 and 1904 to support Anglo-French diplomacy in all disputes of this kind. Thus Germany was betrayed by its two Triple Alliance partners, Russia automatically supported France, and Spain had been bought off with territorial concessions from England and France in 1904. What's more, although Teddy Roosevelt had publicly stated on numerous occasions since September 1905 that Kaiser Wilhelm II had done more than any other single person to make the Portsmouth Peace Conference presided over by Roosevelt possible - by persuading Tsar Nicholas II to accept the peace treaty after its languid conclusion. by persuading Tsar Nicholas II to pursue a moderate course after the ignominious defeat at Tsushima - Teddy thus turned against Wilhelm with relish in Algeciras and, with the weight of the USA, swung unanimously to the side of the Anglo-French team.

Four years earlier, when both England and Germany were trying to collect debts in Venezuela, Teddy simply ignored the fact that England had led the united Anglo-German demarche in Caracas, and directed all its venomous spite against the Kaiser as the alleged real wrongdoer. Algeciras drove out of all rational minds the last remnants of the myth of the Congress of Vienna that there was such a thing as a concert of European powers and even the semblance of a rule of law in Europe and its neighboring territories².

England is working towards a European war

The worst English intrigue since Waterloo began with England's dirty dealings with Japan in 1902 and with France in 1904, but there had been other British plots as well. The only reason the so-called English Century of Peace after 1815 had not led to a new general European war twenty-five years later - in 1840 - was because France had backed down - an event that was followed by a steady decline in the moderate French Orleanian regime (to which England added a final blow in 1846 with its vetoes of the Orleanian-Spanish marriages).

England also failed to expand the Crimean War into a general war in 1854 due to the stubborn resistance of neutral Prussia. And the English ultimatums of 1877 and 1878 to Russia only failed to trigger a general war because Russia backed down - and the same applied to Fascism/Sudan in 1898, when France capitulated to a humiliating English ultimatum for the third time in sixty years.

These are clear examples from the years after Waterloo, when England either wanted or risked a general European war, and this was averted solely through the efforts and sacrifices of others. Six years after Fashoda, in 1904, England concluded a pact with France, with secret additional protocols, which violated international law with regard to Morocco and Egypt, and was concluded by England with the sole ultimate aim of artificially instigating a general European war for the main purpose of destroying the brilliant, enlightened and prosperous German Empire. The German Empire was an alliance of German states which eclipsed anything England had ever accomplished, notwithstanding the fact that British imperialism ruled over nearly all the world's oceans and over one-third of the world's continents.

So much for the vulgar and absurd myth of British court historians like C. K. Webster and American Jewish journalists like Walter Lippmann, the myth of the so-called Golden Century of English peace and the rule of law, adopted as gospel by those chatterers and fools who called themselves the American intelligentsia after the turn of the century. Algeciras proved that the English were still the same crude pirates - disregarding all law - that they had been thirteen generations earlier in the days of the murderous Queen Elizabeth I, when scoundrels like Hawkins and Drake, with the permission of their pirate queen, plundered the colonial empires of Portugal and Spain and began a shameful trade in Negro slaves to the New World, a trade forbidden to the Spanish and Portuguese by the Vatican and their own secular governments.

As with world Jewry, success had in no way lessened the horrors of British imperialism; on the contrary, it had only intensified them. Official England despised the rule of law and human rights more than ever, and British leaders became ever more ambitious and rapacious. Only the dupes of the US establishment could take seriously the hypocrisy with which the English establishment fed its oppressed masses: talk of solemn responsibility and sacrifice for empire. The first at least partially functioning compulsory education law, requiring at least a few years of schooling for the illiterate and illiterate English masses, did not come about until 1900 - nearly four generations after a first-class system of public education had been created in Prussia. England posed as the moral governess of the universe, but in its imperialist policies it embodied the theory and practice of hell.

The era of American naval supremacy

Teddy Roosevelt called the cowardly US military aggression of 1898 against Spain a "brilliant little war", and "as president, Roosevelt favored the great fleet²¹³". In short, his callous brutality and excessive militarism, along with his success in winning the support of American plutocratic miscreants for his rise to power, was all that was needed to make him Mahan's favorite disciple. The US Navy climbed from seventh to second place in the seventeen years from 1890 to 1907. Germany was third in 1907 with 529000 tons behind the USA with 611000 tons. Teddy left the White House for good in 1909, and two years later Germany overtook the USA to become the world's second largest maritime power for the first time. It had 837,000 tons at the time, with the USA in third place with 773,000 tons^h

Mahan believed that Teddy would not have allowed Germany to overtake the U.S. and was furious in 1913 when Wilson cut the U.S. annual naval budget from 137000000 to 127000000 dollars. Even more intolerable for Mahan was Wilson's order of silence of August 5, 1914, which forbade all American military personnel "to express opinions on the military and political consequences of events in Europe^{^5}". Even in America, this draconian Wilsonian gagging of prominent US citizens could only be imagined as a utopian decree that could not be enforced, and would have been met with laughter in any European country in peacetime. The fact that Wilson simultaneously ordered all citizens of the USA to be neutral in their thoughts was reminiscent of the legend of King Knut, the ruler of England, Denmark and Norway, who ordered the incoming tide to stop at a certain point. This was not in keeping with European standards of serious politics.

Ironically, under Wilson, the USA overtook Germany and Great Britain to become the world's number one naval power. It was only after the Washington Naval Conference under Wilson's successor Harding that Britain's leading position was temporarily restored (1922-1942)²¹⁶.

The renewed American dominance from 1942 lasted only twenty-three years until 1965, when the Soviet Union (with ten times the number of naval engineers) replaced the USA as the world's number one naval power—a position that has not been challenged since, a position that has not been challenged by the USA since²¹⁷ ^ The total number of years of American naval supremacy—first under Wilson, then under FDR and his immediate successors—was therefore only twenty-seven—a short generation in the long annals of history. Mahan himself and his military theories were as obsolete as a dinosaur by 1965—not unlike the globally subversive political concepts of Hauser, Wilson, and Baruch that Frank Roosevelt had so slavishly adopted.

In contrast to the longer era of sole British naval supremacy after

Trafalgar (1805), the period of American naval supremacy - apart from being superfluous to US national security interests and a curse to the rest of the world - was actually a very short one-way street. When Teddy Roosevelt, under the aegis of Ma- han, launched the American Grand Fleet Program of the 20th century, the United States was a one-way street. But then, after sixty-five years of outrageous, unprovoked American military aggression in every direction, turning most of the rest of the world into a chaos of bullets and murder, the United States had lost all semblance of national security along with its naval supremacy in the new age of nuclear missiles, and all branches of its political administration and armed forces - once loyal and dependable - had become demoralized nests of disloyalty and governmental disruption (with pensions for droves of mostly unseemly ex-servicemen leaving early, an unbearable burden on the hopelessly bankrupt US treasury).

External and internal decline of the USA since the Second World War

Although the US had countless formal military alliances with smaller states, it was hated by all of these so-called allies, and none of these alliances were worth the paper they were written on. The excessively selfish and bloodthirsty USA stood naked and alone on the world stage, shivering and trembling, with no real friends or allies of any kind. This USA was burdened with a morally and practically bankrupt socio-economic and political system whose stench of rot and decomposition was carried to the farthest corners of the globe by the winds of modern audiovisual communication.

The insignificant Russian naval power, which had been destroyed by Japan and England with the help of Teddy Roosevelt in 1904-1905, became the world's largest Soviet naval power in the post-1945 era. The Soviet Union had easily avoided getting involved in wars after 1945, while the USA suffered bloody defeats in Korea and Vietnam and the military prowess of both England and Japan had long since vanished. In short, the complete and hopeless train wreck of the US was exactly what one could expect from leaders like Woody Wilson and Frank Roosevelt and from the woefully clueless and incompetent Wilsonian and Rooseveltian epigones who did the business of the Jewish and non-Jewish self-serving plutocrats of the US after 1945. Even the overdue Social Security system of the USA, belatedly introduced by Roosevelt in 1937, was hopelessly plundered and bankrupt forty years later, leaving millions of young contributors with no prospect of any return on this part of their enormous tax burden. U.S. white unemployment soared, masked by deceptive statistics concocted specifically to cover up the truth, and encouraged by Section VII of

the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1964, which forced employers to give preference to Negroes, Mexicans, other Latinos and East Asians over whites - while at the same time the Immigration Act of 1965, in a last ditch effort to dilute and thus destroy the American white race, discouraged white immigration and encouraged a veritable flood of colored immigration. Every conceivable mistake was made on purpose to hasten the final catastrophe of the United States. You transit gloria mundi: America had been outrageously arrogant and overconfident in 1945 after the German secret treasonous elite had successfully undermined German military defenses in World War II.

It is amusing to recall how the Soviets, the US and Britain squabbled over their respective shares in the defeat of Germany, which in reality had been brought about entirely by the perverse traditional treasonous elite within Germany. The same United States, barely thirty years later, offered a pitiful spectacle of demoralization, with national morale far lower than at any previous time in its entire history. After this defeat, it was widely acknowledged by economists that the United States would never again be able to balance its trade account because of the poor quality of most American manufactured goods, which were not in demand in foreign markets. The quality of American agricultural products had deteriorated hopelessly due to overexploitation and chemical abuse of the soil, much of which had become toxic and harmful. All major and once abundant mineral resources were on the verge of depletion, and U.S. food exports could not pay for the huge cost of imported foreign oil. The oppressed American masses were more aware than ever that their welfare had never been a major consideration in the formulation of U.S. federal policy. For example, the U.S. had the highest cancer mortality rate in the world, yet even though medical research had proven for years that asbestos pipes cause cancer in humans, municipal water companies across the U.S. continued to replace their metal pipes with asbestos ones because they were cheaper. Isolated discontent has been voiced on talk shows, but the American masses as a whole have remained apathetic and hopeless. Opinion polls revealed that the masses thought the civil service was incorrigibly corrupt, but also that the masses had given up hope that practical reforms in favor of honest administration were possible.

Wilson's huge sea armor

In 1916, when the U.S. was still neutral about World War I, Wilson supported Admiral Fiske's "fleet second to none" doctrine, and by 1919 the U.S. naval budget was 2000000000 dollars - about eighteen times Teddy Roosevelt's largest budget. After the armistice in 1918, Undersecretary of the Navy Frank

Roosevelt fought vigorously to further increase the size of the American fleet instead of reducing it - as would have been normal after the end of a war²¹⁸.

Teddy Roosevelt had written some essays²¹⁹ justifying the German invasion of Belgium at the beginning of the First World War, expecting a pious moral impostor like his hated rival Woody Wilson to make noise about it; but when Wilson continued to ignore him, Teddy was soon overcome by his family's own bloodthirstiness, and by 1915 he "believed there would inevitably be trouble with Germany"²²⁰. It turned out that the First World War was not a naval war. The only major naval battle, that off the Skagerrak in 1916, was a brilliant German victory that the German naval leadership had hoped to avoid and from which it drew no conclusions. Skagerrak was a mere coincidence. Germany's brilliant Admiral v. Tirpitz was dismissed in the first phase of the war, and the German naval leadership's secret decision in October 1918 to abandon the fleet after the war was lost thanks to the rooting at home was an act of political stupidity. The idle crews of the German High Seas Fleet had begun to mutiny under the influence of Marxist propaganda in 1917, and in 1918- instead of leaving-they established communism in the fleet and subsequently spread it throughout Germany.

The submarine, as used by England in the Baltic and Germany in the waters around England and in the Mediterranean, was a formidable new naval weapon, but it was not used skillfully enough in World War I to make a difference (it proved weak against enemy air superiority in World War II). In short, while American militarists noisily promoted naval armaments in England's wake, World War I became primarily a land war, as if Kaiser Wilhelm's great fleet had never been built. The failure of beleaguered Germany to make better use of its fleet than to have it destroyed by the British or sunk by its own crews at Scapa Flow was exactly like Japan's failure in World War II to deploy its mighty Kwantung Army to face the Soviets in Mongolia, Manchuria and Siberia. When the Soviets last invaded Japanese territory in August 1945, this army quickly laid down its arms and was transported to prison camps in arctic climates, where 90 percent of the prisoners died.

The USA under Teddy Roosevelt:
a bomb that could explode at any time

The USA deployed only 253,000 soldiers in the wars against the Spanish and the Filipinos at the turn of the century, a small force indeed compared to the large standing armies of France, Germany or Russia at the time. Teddy Roosevelt wanted to change this long before the First World War. He chose as his Secretary of War the corrupt lawyer of the Tweed Gang, Elihu Root, who

had initially made common cause with the criminal bosses of New York, but then robbed them of their money when they got into trouble. In addition to his own shameful criminal past, Root was a passionate militarist and chauvinist who embodied Dr. Samuel Johnson's famous saying that patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel.

Root increased the peacetime strength of the US Army by more than 300 percent, he founded a new War College and established a permanent American Army General Staff even in peacetime^{22^} These changes during Teddy Roosevelt's first year in the White House (1901-1902) made it easy for the US to raise and train an army of millions when Wilson, after his re-election in 1917, dropped his humanitarian pose and drove America into war against Germany^{22^} Root saw to it that General Leonard Wood - a euphoric militarist, the complete opposite of Teddy Roosevelt and Elihu Root - was appointed Chief of the American General Staff, and in April 1910 (more than four years before the outbreak of war in Europe) this Wood surprised the world with his public advocacy of a huge US peace army. Even a child in 1910 understood that France, Germany and Russia needed large standing armies because of their close proximity to each other, while England or the United States did not because of their naval power and lack of strong land neighbors. Wood's irrational outburst proved that there were pathological forces at work in the ranks of American plutocratic chauvinists, and that long before the First World War there were American plutocratic evildoers thirsting for bloody adventures on a world scale^{22J}.

Privately, Wood admitted that he was deliberately trying to nurture a mindless and automaton-like militarism among the oppressed masses of the United States, so that in the future the plutocratic evildoers would only have to press the "mass hysteria" button when they thought of attacking innocent victims again^{224^} Teddy did everything in his power to create an atmosphere conducive to Wood's nefarious endeavor, and on April 2, 1903 - at a time when he was imagining German political intentions in Venezuela - he gave the following edifying advice to a large public audience in Chicago. On April 2, 1903, at a time when he was fantasizing about German political intentions in Venezuela, he gave the following uplifting advice to a large public audience in Chicago: "Talk softly and carry a big stick, and you will go far."²²⁵ Teddy had once acquired his trademark thug lingo during a brief stint as New York City Police Commissioner, and the fact speaks for itself that in 1903 his crude and bellicose words were immediately and joyfully embraced by the public monopoly media of evildoers.

enthusiasm. For every minute since Teddy took office in 1901, the United States has been something of a big, dangerous bomb that could explode at any time - and as the world has learned to its sorrow, that big, dirty bomb has died many

times over the course of the 20th century.

The plutocrats seek foreign adventures

Jingoism in England during the artificially induced Anglo-Russian crisis of 1877-1878 reflected the skill of Disraeli and other Tory leaders in befuddling the ignorant masses with glamorous foreign adventures at a time when life at home was often shabby, crude, dirty and short. ("We don't want to fight, but if we do: then we have the men, the ships and the money too!") The same situation prevailed in the US before 1914, when the real incomes of workers and the lower middle class were falling year by year, foreign investment in the US exceeded American foreign investment by more than 2,500,000,000 dollars, and the plutocratic miscreants of the US - in total contrast to the hungry masses in town and country - led lives of materialistic splendor that would have put oriental potentates to shame²²⁶.

Anyone who knew how to read could glean the secret behind the US establishment's foreign adventurism from the book on imperialism²²⁷ by John Atkinson Hobson (1858-1940), the best-informed English expert on international political economy and economic imperialism. Hobson explained that America wanted to shovel its way out of international debt, find new profit opportunities for its wrongdoers, and distract its masses with Shakespeare's old formula of keeping fickle minds busy with foreign quarrels-not, by increasing necessary domestic consumption, which would have required sweeping and supposedly dangerous modernization and social reform, but by using American military power as a bludgeon to force weaker nations to buy inferior and unwanted American surplus goods²²⁸.

Although a land of opportunity - due to its enormous size and natural resources (which would be largely exhausted by the middle of the 20th century) - the USA was nevertheless known worldwide before 1914 as a corrupt country where only a few unscrupulous families enjoyed wealth by criminal means, while the masses toiled in a crude environment without a culture of their own, living in fear, poverty and ignorance. For example, during a single steelworkers' strike, that of Homestead, Pennsylvania in 1892, more than two hundred workers were gunned down and killed by Pinkerton detectives.

The largely inaccurate myth of the US as a prosperous society only emerged after Woody Wilson's international crimes and the shameful American blood-money profiteering of the First World War. The restless USA of the 19th century. As the top historian of the era, Francis Parkman, puts it, the restless 19th century United States pushed forward into the vacuum on its "frontier" against the sporadic resistance of a small and sparsely distributed population of

native Indians - but not out of sheer adventurousness in the manner of the Danish Vikings in primitive Poland or the Swedish Vikings in primitive Russia of the early Middle Ages, but because the plutocratic miscreants of the USA controlled public life and kept the price of all available land so high that the pale-faced, malnourished common people of Missouri and Tennessee could not survive. For better or worse, without the necessary frontier skills, they were driven forward in desperation until they reached far-flung places like California or Oregon, where they were almost instantly subjugated anew by plutocratic miscreants - now through the tyrannical private plutocratic power of the corrupt, tax-funded railroad companies on which the farmers of the West depended for the supply of their needs and the removal of their crops. Throughout the century, the American masses were hunted like helpless sheep by their cruel and cunning exploiters, and in the 20th century, when the domestic "frontier" was over, the wealthy few of the ilk of J. P. Morgan and John D. Rockefeller set out to repeat the whole process on a global stage²²⁹.

America's China imperialism

Teddy Roosevelt eagerly promoted the American China Development Company, a corrupt consortium of financier J. P. Morgan and railroad boss Edward Harriman (father of Stalin supporter Avereh Harriman), formed for the sole purpose of increasing the profits America's evildoers were bayoneting out of a devastated China²³⁰^ Teddy was even more disappointed than these two when England refused to give them a substantial stake in sucking China's provinces dry through a monopolistic railroad system to be built, not subject to Chinese price controls. Later, with the support of Woody Wilson, Morgan and Harriman did make their profit in China by merging their own company with the international consortium under British control, and it was this group that in 1926 the so-called National Chinese dictator Chiang Kai-shek - in reality just an Anglo-American puppet - ceded the last semblance of independent agency²³¹^ Wang Ching-wei, the favorite disciple and declared successor of Dr. Sun Yat-sen (the father of the Chinese Revolution of 1911-1949), had more independence than Chiang in 1940 as the leader of the Chinese Nanking government, which fought as an ally of Japan against Chiang and Mao, the puppet of Winston Churchill and Frank Roosevelt - and yet millions of gullible Americans, stuffed with official US war propaganda inspired by Rockefeller, believed for years that there was such a thing as the legendary Free China under Chiang Kai-shek.

F.J. Turner's seductive thesis²³² that American expansion was based on an irresistible, perpetual drive that would come to rest only when the whole earth was brought under America's permanent, messianic leadership was believed verbatim by Woody Wilson (who had met Turner briefly at Johns Hopkins University), and also by Frank Roosevelt, who was always Wilson's most ardent

disciple in all things. Turner's thesis became known as the doctrine of America's "Restless Energy" ²³³

How Wilson became president

Wilson was fifty-four when he entered active political life in 1911 with his inauguration as governor of New Jersey, and he was fifty-six (the age at which Hitler died) at the time of his first inauguration as OS president in March 1913²³⁴ Champ Clark of Missouri, whom Wilson had narrowly cheated out of the Democratic nomination with the help of the machinations of Edward Mandell House, had been speaker of the OS House of Representatives at the time of that Baltimore Democratic Party convention. In contrast to the reactionary and politically inexperienced Wilson, Champ Clark was a true Democratic progressive who had served more than twenty years in the U.S. Congress since 1890.

The rigged Democratic Party convention of 1912, which nominated Wilson in response to grotesque and deceptive machinations, was an American national disgrace, and so was the disgusting presidential election of that year. The final outcome was already predetermined by the disgraceful way in which Teddy Roosevelt had needlessly divided the Republican Party for the sake of sheer vanity and self-gratification. From the very beginning, American organized political life had become a terrifying collection of ideological monstrosities. True universal suffrage did not set in until after World War II with the elimination of unfair federal poll taxes - by contrast, it had been successfully introduced in Germany by Bismarck nearly a hundred years earlier - and in most major American elections since World War II, the bosses of the two so-called political parties have tampered with the results. (In reality, both so-called political parties have served the same set of masters for decades, so that the de facto political reality of the US is a one-party system - just as it was in the USSR - with the American myth of the two-party system being flaunted solely as a false democratic cover in the most hypocritical and deceptive manner). Despite this limited and manipulated vote under the pretense of a two-party system, nearly a third of American presidents have been elected with only a minority of the vote. The actual presidential election in the US is the indirect one in the so-called electoral college, with outdated rules rendering the majority of votes ineffective. Duroselle correctly observed that a new election should have been held after far less than 30 percent of U.S. white male adults (most Negroes, Asians and Mexicans were not allowed to vote) voted for Wilson in November 1912, who received 42 percent of the votes cast, with millions of eligible voters not even going to the polls. But thanks to the crazy American electoral college system that Fighting Bob LaFollette had hoped to eliminate for years, but which still exists today, Wilson won forty of the forty-eight states. Arizona and New

Mexico had been admitted to the Union just before the election that year, and Wilson, of course, captured both. (Nevada, which in 1864 did not even have the population required by law, had been hastily admitted to the Union by Abraham Lincoln to give him the weight he needed in the Electoral College to win re-election. In the previous presidential election in 1860, Lincoln had only received 39 percent of the votes cast at the time).

Wilson as leader of the USA

Thus, quite apart from Roosevelt's betrayal of his 1911-1912 promises to LaFollette, Wilson became American president in 1913 by fraud. He had begun his political career in 1910 after ruining his academic career at Princeton by betraying his Democratic supporters in New Jersey to win the gubernatorial nomination. Since Wilson held nothing sacred except his fanatical devotion to Judaism, he had no compunction about deceiving William Jennings Bryan - the three-time Democratic standard-bearer in the 1896, 1900, and 1908 presidential elections - to win the 1912 presidential nomination. Wilson was also such a blatant Anglomaniac that his daily newspaper was the London Times, and for nearly thirty years he had publicly advocated tossing the U.S. Constitution of 1787 to the scrap heap and remaking the U.S. political system to suit British cabinet government. This was the man who, four years later, led America into the First World War by illegal means and immediately thereafter prepared to hand over the dictatorial powers that had accrued to him by entering the war to Bernard Baruch, a corrupt Jewish speculator who had never worked at all in the usual sense of the word and had never been a candidate in any US election.

Wilson then tried to impose permanent global military alliances on the USA - a direct violation of George Washington's previously respected advice in his Farewell Address of 1796 - including a permanent American military alliance in peacetime with England and France. Wilson's signature was already on the treaty of alliance, but it was rejected by the US Senate in 1919 and by the American electorate the following year. Moreover, six and a half years after entering active federal politics, Wilson went insane for good. His career in politics was brief, but the damage he caused was immense.

Less than ten years after Wilson died in 1924, oblivious to his surroundings, his most fanatical and enthusiastic disciple Frank Roosevelt arrived in the White House, where he managed to hold on by any corrupt means for a little over twelve years, and where he managed to surpass Wilson in damage to the US and the rest of the world, and especially in the destruction of most of Europe. These two perversely sensual womanizers, for whom the bond of marriage never meant more than a front for their illicit sexual activities, were

uniquely devoid of all the decency and courage that would have qualified them to lead a great nation.

William Loeb, the son of Teddy Roosevelt's chief political aide and editor of the Union Leader (the largest daily newspaper in northern New England), was criticized by reporters from the New York Times for saying that a wife-swapper like Nelson Rockefeller was not the right caliber for president. Loeb was reminded that he too had been through a divorce. To this Loeb replied curtly that, unlike Rockefeller, he was not running for the presidency either. Nothing could illustrate more clearly how accustomed the American public has become to corrupt leaders because the highly corrupt nominating system of conventions since 1840 inevitably brings the scum to the top.

L. D. Brandeis and the Supreme Court

After House, the Texas Jew and behind-the-scenes political wheeler-dealer, had won Wilson over in November 1911, Woody declared that "his thoughts and mine were one" ²³⁵. The same conquest of Wilson was repeated by two other Jews, Louis Demhitz Brandeis and Bernard Baruch. At first, each of the three Jews dominated Wilson in a particular area, until Baruch finally became the supreme lord and master of all Wilson's political activities and also of a large part of his private life ²³⁶. Duroselle is right to say that Brandeis, who was first and foremost committed to World Zionism and its American branch (of which he was president), imparted his "ideology" ²³⁷ to Wilson.

Through Wilson, Brandeis achieved his goal of being appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court. There he strove with total success to impose his novel doctrine - which later motivated such all-powerful federal judges as Black, Douglas and Warren - that sociological considerations, especially in the interests of so-called racial minorities and special economic pressure groups, were more important than legal considerations, not only in the interpretation but also in the arbitrary amendment of the U.S. Constitution or any other modern constitution. ¹⁹³⁷, shortly before Brandeis's death in 1941, his ideas began to dominate federal court election rulings. Chief Justice C. E. Hughes, a moral relativist, sold the federal court to Roosevelt and his New Deal-even though FDR's plan to increase the number of federal judges had foundered on the opposition of Democratic leader Grenville Clark-and ruthlessly overrode the dissent of the four remaining, genuinely traditionalist federal judges. Quite naturally, Roosevelt's own judicial appointments from 1937 onwards-beginning with former Klu Klux Klan activist Hugo Black of Alabama, who had morphed into a leftist-all involved men who had nothing but contempt for the American political tradition and the idea of the rule of law.

Hughes' 1937 betrayal of principle led directly to the blatantly pro-Communist and anti-traditionalist Warrenese Federal Court of 1953. It was

the friend of Red Army Marshal Zhukov and longtime admirer of Stalin, U.S. President D.D.

Eisenhower, who appointed Warren as Chief Justice. The Warren Court still exists today - even though Warren resigned in 1971 and died in 1974 - because all judicial appointments since 1953 by Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon have gone to men who agreed with Warren's basic views. Nixon's only attempt to appoint a judge from South Carolina who fundamentally disagreed with Warren was rejected by the US Senate.

After the end of Ford's management of the notoriously corrupt Nixon regime, a new and equally corrupt administration began in 1977 with President Carter, but because Carter's own values and beliefs are identical to Warren's (Carter has been a member of the Rothschilds' and Rockefellers' tri-cameral think tank since 1970}, there is no prospect of a change in the now firmly established Warrenian federal court in any foreseeable future.

Brandeis was not only the first Jew on the US Supreme Court. He was also the originator of all the evil ideas that the federal court applied after it was sold by Hughes to Frank Roosevelt in 1937. These ideas have totally and hopelessly screwed up US constitutional law and American constitutional theory. If it were not already too late to reform the U.S. constitutional system, the only salvation would be to overturn all the major constitutional decisions of the federal court over the two generations since 1937.

Brandeis as Wilson's advisor

Louis Demhitz Brandeis' father was born in the Austrian Empire. He was a typical Khazar-Galician-Jewish peddler with unlimited financial ambition and complete disregard for the ethical inhibitions of Christians. L. D. Brandeis was born in Louisville, Kentucky in 1856 to a Jewish immigrant family that had become bourgeois and wealthy. He was exactly the same age as Woody Wilson and - unlike him - reached the ripe old age of eighty-five. Brandeis was unable to enter Harvard's undergraduate college because of its numerus clausus for Jews, which remained in place until after the end of World War II, but he entered Harvard Graduate Law School, where there was no such restriction, and became a judge soon after his graduation at a remarkably young age.

Brandeis voted Republican up to and including the 1908 presidential election, but then switched his political sympathies before the next presidential election after meeting Woody Wilson at a summer retreat on the New Jersey shore. Wilson "found himself immediately attracted to him" ²³⁸ He confessed to Brandeis that he had always been a conservative Southern Democrat, but that

since Progressivism had become the trump card through the efforts of Bob LaFollette, and also because his - Wilson's - friendship with House had revealed to him a great future of Jewish messianic radicalism, he had come to realize that he needed a new political beginning. He found himself repelled by LaFollette's concept of the essential personal integrity of the political leader and by the ideas of George Records, the head of the LaFollette Progressives in the state of New Jersey. Brandeis assured Wilson that he abhorred LaFollette and all American small-town, popular Progressivism, and that the future of the whole world lay with metropolitan Jewish radicalism. Brandeis frankly told Wilson that his allegiance was first and foremost to the two spearheads of modern world Jewry, Zionism and Bolshevism, and he advised Wilson to shape his own thinking accordingly in order to profit from the coming worldwide victories of organized and wealthy world Jewry. Wilson assured Brandeis that House had taught him to admire everything Jewish in the field of politics.

Brandeis was impressed by Wilson's visible sincerity in subordinating his own career to Jewish goals, and so he willingly drafted for Wilson the "New Freedom Program," which included a feigned commitment to progressivism and won Wilson the 1912 election. Wilson, whose first wife from Georgia was still alive in 1912, celebrated his presidential election victory by rushing to Bermuda for an extended rendezvous with Mrs. Peck, his favored mistress whom he had first met in that British resort six years earlier²³⁹

Wilson's diplomats

House also appeared in Bermuda, where he immediately filled for Wilson seven of the ten cabinet posts in the administration that was to take office on March 4, 1913²⁴⁰ Although Wilson and House both disliked and feared William J. Bryan - because of his political honorableness and opposition to American imperialism - House informed Wilson that they would have to make Bryan Secretary of State in order to win his support for Wilson's reelection in 1916. House also assured Wilson that Bryan could be bypassed in the field of world diplomacy by not consulting him on Wilson's program of overseas ambassadorial and envoy appointments and, moreover, by instructing the diplomats to send only cursory reports to Bryan and to pass all important information directly to Wilson and his White House advisers. Once Wilson had his own people in all the key overseas positions, an invisible foreign policy of de facto effectiveness could begin, leaving Bryan - who had no diplomatic experience - with the idea that he was more than a mere representative figure on the US political stage.

Under these circumstances, it is not at all surprising that two years later, in

1915, Bryan resigned from Wilson's cabinet in disgust. The same strategy was repeated twenty years later by Frank Roosevelt and Bernard Baruch when they turned Senator Cordeil Hull of Tennessee, a dignified mediocrity, into a representative Secretary of State, but gave all real power in American foreign policy to Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau, Jr. (Once, when Hull couldn't even be bothered to attend a cabinet meeting, he sarcastically apologized to FDR that he was too busy drafting a new OS tax policy). And yet both the personalities and situations in the Bryan and Hull cases were very different. Hull's Jewish wife adored Morgenthau, and Hull clung to his post in FDR's cabinet almost to the end, where he was replaced by Ed Stettinius, a totally incompetent zero. (Stettinius couldn't even correctly read speeches made to him by others). Hull's objection to the barbaric and disgraceful Morgenthau Plan, accepted by Churchill in 1944 for the permanent destruction of Germany, was the straw that broke the camel's back, for Roosevelt and Morgenthau were no longer willing to accept the slightest criticism of their diabolical foreign policy, which in 1944-1945 was conducted solely for Stalin's benefit.

Typical of the skill with which House handled Wilson's overseas appointments was the posting to London of Walter H. Page, a personal friend of Wilson's who, like Wilson himself, adored England and, as long as he served at the Court of St. James, put England above the United States in any conflict of interest. Wilson, who never criticized Page for his improper conduct, had made his own first trip to Europe at the age of thirty-six, but the only country he visited was England, and he did not return to Europe until 1919, the year he became mentally ill. The posting of James Gerard, who hated Germany, as permanent American ambassador to Berlin was also due to House. Gerard, along with a group of Jewish friends, eagerly advocated a pre-emptive war against Germany in 1933 during the first year of Hitler's chancellorship²⁴

James Gerard, like Teddy Roosevelt's favorite Elihu Root, was up to his neck in crime: in the New York political machine Tweed-Tammany Hall, where he managed to get hold of the money that enabled him to develop a lavish hospitality after his arrival in Berlin in 1913. Gerard had so much dirt on his hands, politically speaking, that Wilson was able to use him with impunity to sign the Sussex Agreement with Kaiser Wilhelm II in 1916, an agreement that immediately weighed heavily on the German war effort, but at the same time required Wilson to support the moderate peace that Germany craved, and would only come due if and when Wilson was re-elected in November 1916. No wonder the German press was overwhelmingly pro-Wilsonian during the 1916 presidential election campaign. Gerard knew at the time of the signing that Wilson had never had the slightest intention of fulfilling his solemn obligation to the Kaiser. The whole affair was a ruse de guerre (a ruse of war) by which the Kaiser - eager to avoid war with the USA at all costs - was tricked into

restricting the German V-boat war to the considerable detriment of the German war effort of 1916-1917, while mountains of American war materiel poured into England and France.

F. D. Roosevelt as Secretary of State of the Navy

House arranged for the influential politician Josephus Daniels to become Secretary of the Navy in 1913 - a post for which the lazy man from North Carolina had no qualifications or aptitude, but House remembered the fateful role that 1898 Undersecretary of the Navy Teddy Roosevelt had played under his lethargic superior, Secretary of State Long, and installed Frank Roosevelt as Undersecretary of the Navy at the age of thirty; and House knew very well that Teddy Roosevelt's passion for a powerful US fleet had been nothing compared to FDR's, who even advocated peacetime conscription to provide the personnel for a huge fleet.

Frank Roosevelt had been raised with three passions from his earliest childhood, and all three were instilled in him by his young mother, who was closer to him in age than her ailing, aging and bumbling husband James - a man who had never worked, but lived a life of comfortable luxury on his fabulous New York estate in the Hudson Valley. The three passions were: 1. horseback riding - which Frank and his mother did every day when they were at home in Hyde Park. 2. traveling to Europe every year, which Frank enjoyed immensely - except for the time when his mother had him attend a German school in Bad Nauheim; and 3. the militarism of the Fleet glimmer. Frank not only had Yankee pirates of the China trade on his father's side of the family. His mother's Dutch Delano family had been even more rapacious and active in 19th century China than the Roosevelts. His mother bought Frank many expensive boats and encouraged him to spend as much time on the water as possible - a habit he never lost. His mother lived until 1941, just three and a half years before his own death. Along with his long line of mistresses, she dominated every waking moment of his time, from his entry into the Wilson cabinet to the eve of Pearl Harbor²⁴² ²⁴³

Daniels as American Secretary of State for the Navy was the same as the English Parliamentary First Lord of the Admiralty in Lord Melbourne's Cabinet of 1834. Like Daniels, his real occupation was pig farming, and he good-humoredly stated in a Cabinet that Melbourne himself described as a delightful comedy of errors that his only qualification for the Admiralty post was that he was totally "at sea" (meaning, figuratively, "at a loss"). Daniels had no interest in the US Navy, either in 1913 or at any other time. He remained the nominal head of the Navy Department from 1913-1921, but in those crucial years the young

Frank Roosevelt was the real head of the American Navy^{24\}

As in all American presidential elections after 1900-except that of 1920-foreign policy was not an issue in the 1912 campaign after LaFollette was eliminated, for there was complete agreement on this issue among the three surviving candidates, Wilson, Taft and Teddy Roosevelt. Frank Roosevelt had become a Democrat to deliberately distance himself from his once powerful Republican cousin Teddy, whom he disliked. As his wife Eleanor - cousin to both - was partial to Teddy, Teddy was the best man at Frank's wedding in 1905. After Eleanor discovered Frank's particularly blatant marital infidelity in 1918, Frank and Eleanor only became close around the time of Frank's polio illness in 1921. At no time after 1918 did Frank confide his secret political plans to Eleanor, even if appearances were sometimes deceptive, as both were enthusiastic admirers of Stalin.

Wilson's imperialist tendencies

Wilson, Taft and Teddy Roosevelt were all enthusiastic about the US war against Spain in 1898, the 1898-1901 war against Aguinaldo and the Filipino freedom fighters, Britain's final defeat of the Chinese Manchu dynasty during the 1890s, Britain's humiliation of France at Fashoda (1898), the British war of aggression to destroy the Boer republics in South Africa in 1899-1902, the British breach of allegiance to Morocco in 1904, whose independence had also been guaranteed by the USA in the Morocco Treaty of 1880, the Japanese war of aggression under British auspices against Russia (1904-1905) and the diplomatic and military encirclement of Germany, which King Edward VII. of England personally at the Reval Conference in 1908. None of them held it against Lloyd George and Winston Churchill that they tried to turn the relatively harmless Franco-German Second Moroccan Crisis of 1911 into a global war. This crisis was in fact so harmless that the Russian Prime Minister Stolypin said in September 1911: "If France stumbles into a war with Germany over Morocco as a result of British warmongering since July 1911, then Russia does not feel obliged to provide more help for France than France had given its Russian ally during the Russo-Japanese War^{245^}.

Like Teddy Roosevelt and Taft, Wilson agreed with Mahan's concept of economic imperialism, although he disliked Taft's slogan of "dollar diplomacy," and he also admitted that the quality of American goods was too low for successful trade in competition with England, Germany, France, and Japan - unless the American flag preceded and protected trade once it was established.

Wilson became very clear during the 1912 presidential campaign when he stated that the existing U.S. colonies were not enough, and he agreed to "the acquisition of colonies" for America's future foreign policy^{2^}.

Wilson had publicly advocated U.S. leadership over the entire earth as early as 1887, and he was a messianic man in his nature. The political milieu in which he worked was so crude, and the oppressed population he led so ignorant, that he often got away scot-free with slips that would not have been tolerated in a more educated environment. In short, Wilson's misdeeds and crimes during the brief six years from 1913 to 1919 did not occur in a vacuum, and Mommsen's "Great Men" theory of history was applicable to colossal leaders such as Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, and Napoleon 1st, but not to the pathological, unstable, and weak individual known to history as Woodrow Thomas Wilson.

Wilson's political and personal stature

For a few months in 1919, the global Jewish mass media had fooled much of the world into believing that Wilson was a man of unusual stature - but as Abraham Lincoln had observed at a time when Wilson was a boy, you can fool all the people some of the time, some of the people all of the time, but never all the world all of the time. The American public's last illusions about Wilson vanished - notwithstanding the World War II Jewish film that glorified him - with the publication of Gene Smith's final analysis of Wilson's many weaknesses^{2^} Wilson was a pathetic political puppet of world Jewry, who briefly floundered across the political stage of New Jersey, then the United States, and later the world, but the ideas he propagated were never of his own making, and he lacked any of the qualities in the arena of practical action that could have at least partially rehabilitated him in the human sense. Nothing could make up for the crimes and follies of his political rule. Humanity still has to pay - and will continue to pay for generations to come - for the debt of human rights and values created by Woody Wilson and his most ardent disciple, Frank Roosevelt.

The thin content of Wilson's published works - much of which was plagiarized, for example his first printed essay on Bismarck, which was taken from a work by Professor Marquardson of Erlangen, translated for him by a friend - contains no trace of diplomatic historiography. Duroselle has correctly noted that Wilson never attempted to familiarize himself with American, European or Far Eastern diplomatic history, despite his election as president in 1913^{24B}.

Nor did Wilson accept much in the way of Christian theology from his father,

the Presbyterian minister. Instead, he cherished a fondness for the radical humanism of Auguste Comte (1798-1857), who had rehashed Condorcet's fairy tale of steady human progress and man's ultimate capacity for perfection²⁴⁹ Perhaps the best refutation of this nonsense was Friedrich Nietzsche's occasional observation that the existence of a stomach in man should suffice to destroy forever the grandiose illusion of man's capacity for perfection.

Wilson was obsessed with the idea that the crude, corrupt and uncultured US should "lead the world", and Duroselle again hit the mark with his observation that Wilson "had an exaggerated idea of presidential power and too openly despised Congress"²⁵⁰ It came as a surprise to everyone when, on March 11, 1913, Wilson publicly and ostentatiously distanced himself from Teddy Roosevelt and Taft on the issue of dollar diplomacy in Latin America. Big Lub scoffed at this, and Teddy was furious. And yet it was Wilson - and not Taft or Teddy - who took the old Virgin Islands colony from Denmark in 1917, and it was also Wilson - and not Taft or Teddy - who repeatedly invaded Mexico with strong US forces in 1914, 1915 and 1916.

Henry Lane Wilson - no relation to Woody - was Taft's ambassador to Mexico and engineered the so-called Great Mexican Revolution of November 1911, which ousted longtime Mexican President Porfirio Diaz and brought Mexico under political control for good.

control of a small minority of Mexican anti-Catholic Freemasons. The Maurerturn has remained in the saddle in Mexico City from 1911 to the present. Taft's ambassador was not entirely satisfied with the first phase of the victorious revolution because its initial leader, Francisco Madero, was excessively noisy even for a Mexican politician and, worse, began to resist the main purpose of this latest American-fabricated revolution, which was to give the United States a larger share of the mining and oil concessions and the European powers less. (Diaz had been finished off by the USA because he was doing too much business with England, France and Germany). H. L. Wilson thus took a cue from British practice and arranged for Madero's assassination, which took place shortly before the end of Taft's term (and less than three weeks before Wilson's inauguration) on February 13, 1913. Ambassador Wilson then ecstatically reported to Washington/D.C. that the new Mexican dictator, the military boss Victoriano Huerta, was ideal from the American point of view, and that a new victorious phase of US economic imperialism in Mexico could now begin²⁵¹.

Wilson publicly distances himself from the policies of his predecessors

Henry Lane Wilson, however, was far from receiving the personal reward and guaranteed retention of his post in Mexico City that he expected for his

cheap and easy double coup policy - indeed, he even suggested that the USA could establish a protectorate over the whole country, as in the case of Cuba, so soft had he made Mexico. But no, he was recalled without notice by President Wilson on March 13, 1913, two days after the inflammatory presidential speech denouncing the misdeeds of Teddy Roosevelt and Taft. In an interview with the international press, President Wilson stated bluntly what he thought of the new Huerta government in Mexico: "I will not recognize a government of murderers." ²⁵² In other words, Wilson's behavior toward Mexico in 1913 was as vile as Jimmy Carter's toward Brazil in 1977 - when Carter's hypocritical blather about alleged disrespect for human rights cost the United States the forty-year-old alliance with Brazil that had been entered into in 1937 by Frank Roosevelt and the brutally corrupt Brazilian dictator Getulio Vargas. (Carter made no similar human rights criticism of Israel, Turkey or Iran in 1977).

The assassination of Madera was deplorable, but it was a murder plot instigated solely by the US, in which Huerta was a reluctant participant; and when it came to murderers, there was nothing in Mexican history as shameful as the 90 percent genocide of the American Indians, the original Americans, or like the Hun-like devastation of the U.S. Deep South by General Sherman and General Butler in execution of some of President Lincoln's criminal war orders, or like the genocide of hundreds of thousands of Filipino civilians by General Funston during the U.S.-Philippine War of 1898-1901 to enslave the archipelago of the Philippines under the permanent yoke of American imperialism. Although Wilson, who was from the South, had denounced Lincoln's warlike devastation in the American South as the greatest crime against humanity in history, he did not deplore the genocide of the Indians and explicitly endorsed General Funston's campaign of murder in the Philippines. Therefore, it was pure hypocrisy for Wilson to denounce the Mexican regime as a "government of murderers" without adding that he himself and his own government were even worse murderers.

Thus, at the very beginning of Wilson's presidency, the American public was given more than ample proof that their new president, foisted upon them by people who met in conspiratorial circumstances in smoke-filled rooms, was a master liar of unsurpassable bellicosity who was certain to get the US into endless foreign policy trouble. A significant portion of the US population harbored an inveterate racial hatred of their Mexican neighbors, who were almost universally referred to contemptuously as the "Greasers." Moreover, the US Jewish mass media went out of its way to create foreign trouble of any kind that would further the expansion of US imperialist influence, and so Wilson's attitude toward Mexico, though vindictive and irrational, was widely and extremely popular with the US public. At Wilson's inauguration, a dozen years had passed since the US had fought a major war. The American war against

Colombia in Panama had only been a small war. Generations of slaughtering the Indians had come to an end. So there was a burning desire for war in the hearts of many Americans, especially those along the East Coast not far from Wall Street, where Bernard Baruch had made his enormous fortune.

Wilson's insincerity towards Mexico

Some people naturally assumed Wilson was sincere when he talked about ending the Taft administration's dollar diplomacy in Latin America, but Wilson - whose entry into New Jersey politics had been organized by Colonel Harvey, a partner in the J. P. Morgan firm - had no intention of dismantling dollar diplomacy, rather of accelerating it, and his speech against Teddy and Taft was just a cynical smokescreen designed to deceive and confuse his critics. Nothing of what Taft and his ambassador had done in Mexico was too brutal for Wilson's own taste, but he wanted to create of himself the impression of a new American political leader of a special kind, and one of the best ways to accomplish this was to renounce the Taft legacy in Mexico and denounce the general policy of Taft and the remarkable tactical successes of Ambassador Wilson. Duroselle, an unequaled master in recognizing the psychological aspects of historical action, placed the main emphasis on the personal prejudice of Colonel E. M. House, at that time the Jew who controlled Wilson's policy: Like most other Texans, House hated Mexicans even more intensely than the average American-roughly as the English settlers in Northern Ireland hated the Irish even more intensely than the average Englishman²⁵³^

After making it finally clear on May 23, 1913, that he would never recognize the Huerta regime in Mexico - despite the immense concessions Huerta offered the U.S. in hopes of normal peaceful relations - and after publicly denouncing Ambassador Wilson on August 14, 1913, in an unprecedented manner (forever disgracing the ex-diplomat), Wilson carefully concealed how eager he was for the war against Mexico that was soon to follow. The approach of this new unnecessary war was entirely due to his own depravity and that of E.M. House, his chief Jewish advisor. On August 27, 1913, Wilson informed the U.S. Congress that he was not contemplating a U.S. military attack on Mexico at the present time, ever

but pursuing a policy of "wait and see" ²⁵⁴.

The same scheme was repeated by Wilson with unsurpassable precision two years later, after the successful arrangement by British Navy Minister Winston Churchill to sink the Lusitania, a British Cunard steamer loaded with munitions, officially an auxiliary cruiser. The fact that Churchill had

ostentatiously accused the USA of a criminal policy of aggression against Spain in 1898 did not bother Wilson in the least²⁵⁵. From 1915 onwards, Wilson sanctioned the blatant British violations of the law of the sea and at the same time held Germany to a "strict responsibility" that did not even recognize basic German rights under the Law of the Sea. Once he had created this situation, which he knew he could launch a war against Germany at any time when the time seemed ripe, he again told the US Congress in his usual language that his 1915 policy towards the German Empire, much like his 1913 policy towards Mexico, was a policy of "wait and see"²⁵⁶.

Wilson's feud with Teddy Roosevelt

Although Wilson knew from numerous sources that former President Teddy Roosevelt heartily hated him for his March 11, 1913 speech, he never relented in persecuting his predecessors through public attacks. This campaign continued until Teddy died in 1919, and resulted in Teddy suddenly changing his tune. Teddy had been blissful when, during the war with Spain, President McKinley gave him a glamorous command in preparation for the invasion of Cuba, for which he was not at all qualified, while William J. Bryan, who nearly defeated McKinley in the presidential election of 1898, had to march his troops up and down the Florida coast without any prospect of a commission beyond the sea.

After Wilson thrust the US into the war against Germany by illegal means in 1917, Teddy forgot his pride and made numerous requests to Wilson, the wartime commander-in-chief of the entire US armed forces, for military assignment in Europe (where Teddy lost a son in the fighting). These humiliating requests by Teddy were not even acknowledged by Wilson, let alone answered, even though Teddy was a two-term ex-president of the United States and also had military experience. No wonder that old acquaintances, who knew Wilson well enough, rejected offers to serve under him in political functions. It can be seen from countless examples that once Wilson had taken offense at something, he never gave up this attitude. He was no less persistent in the opposite direction: Long before the U.S. Senate rejected the 1919 Treaty of Versailles, British and French leaders had admitted that the treaty contained flaws on which they wanted to make concessions so that Wilson could get Senate approval - Wilson, however, was the only one to insist to the point of derangement, that the treaty, as it stood, was absolutely perfect, and he stuck to this assertion even though the treaty completely disregarded his own Fourteen Points, which he himself, for almost eighteen months from January 1918 until the signing of the treaty, had described as absolutely indispensable for a just and

lasting peace. In short, Wilson's policy in international relations was not only deceptive, unfair and criminally aggressive; it was also inconsistent.

On April 6, 1914 - three years to the day before his declaration of war on Germany - Wilson had inflicted another insult on Teddy Roosevelt by concluding the Treaty of Bogota with Colombia, in which he publicly expressed his "sincere regret" for the unprovoked American military attack on Colombia eleven years earlier under Teddy's leadership. Wilson committed the United States to pay reparations of 25000000 dollars to Colombia as penance for Teddy's crimes against Colombia, against international law and the rule of law everywhere. Teddy's friend Henry Cabot Lodge, who in the meantime had risen from the House of Representatives to the Senate, was able to block the necessary two-thirds majority in the Senate, so the treaty only came into force eight years later, in 1922, when President Harding pushed it through the Senate with the argument that the treaty would pay off economically by improving the chances of the USA snapping up new Colombian oil concessions sought by European states. In April 1914, Teddy Roosevelt had publicly denounced the Wilsonian Treaty with Colombia as a "crime against the United States" ²⁵⁷.

Wilson denies all aggressive intentions

This feud between the two pretentious political criminals Teddy and Woody became a problem for American court historians, who in time tended to split into pro-Teddy and pro-Woody parties, though this (like everything else in the monolithic politics of the 20th century US establishment) was a matter of imaginary nuance that was hard to discern in reality. The myriad emotive rants that have been made about this inane subject in both directions have always been hilarious. The only sensible judgment for the decent historian is based on Mercutio's formula in Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*: a plague on both your houses.

Wilson was also unhappy with the alleged meagerness of the concessions to England in Teddy's 1901 Hay-Pauncefote Treaty on Panama, negotiated by Secretary of State John Hay, who had certainly been the most emotional and irrational Anglophile American politician until Wilson himself came along. Wilson claimed that Teddy had betrayed England and that the entire treaty would have to be renegotiated in order to achieve an even more blatant most-favored nation treatment of England in the use of the Panama Canal, which was economically and militarily vital to the United States and was completed and opened just weeks before the outbreak of World War I.

The speech that provides the clearest insight into Woody Wilson's morbid mind was delivered in Mobile, Alabama, on October 27, 1913. Among other gems - including the arrogant boast that only the US could decide which Latin American regimes would be eligible for international recognition and which

would not - is the following - from the same Wilson who a few years later was to carry out annexations in the Western Hemisphere for the US: "I want to take this opportunity to state that the United States never wants to conquer another foot of ground."259

Even if Wilson had been sincere in making such a statement - which of course he was not - it would have been euphoric and foolish, since Wilson was only a Democratic Party politician, elected by a minority of those eligible to vote in the first place, and who in the middle of his four-year term had no authority to make commitments of any kind for the future of the United States, either as to annexation or cession of territory. At most, he could speak for the remaining three years of his own term - and even then, his veto against an annexation decided by the US Congress could be overridden at any time by Congress with a two-thirds majority of both houses. As it turned out, however, he eagerly acted contrary to his own words without any input from the US Congress by seizing the Danish colonies in the Caribbean. His disciple Frank Roosevelt then invaded the Danish colony of Greenland without notice or even negotiation and also participated in the illegal British military occupation of Iceland even before Pearl Harbor, after England had established itself there in April 1940 despite the protests of both Reykjavik and the Danish government in Copenhagen.

Wilson and Anglo-American imperialism in China

Meanwhile, Wilson continued to automatically oppose everything Teddy had done, accompanied by empty rhetoric and inflated idealism and equally bad Wilsonian policy. It was easy for Wilson to persuade his first Secretary of State, Bryan, to oppose Teddy Roosevelt's secret agreement with Harriman and Morgan to support British imperialist control of China for the benefit of American plutocrats. Bryan, a popular political radical from Nebraska, sincerely opposed U.S. imperialism abroad and the excesses of the dictatorial plutocratic oligarchy at home. Bryan's Cross of Gold speech260 of 1896 remains the most eloquent and effective indictment of American plutocracy ever made. The particular problem in the Far East was the international financial syndicate in China, which was controlled by England. The British dictated to the hundreds of millions of Chinese what they could import, what they could export, what they could collect in customs duties, which Chinese and how many were executed or imprisoned under the authority of British and other extraterritorial foreign courts in China, where and when and how many British and foreign troops and gunboats - including American ones - were stationed, which foreigners were allowed to monopolize China's coal, China's iron,

copper, gold and silver, what China was or was not allowed to produce, how much precious metal was taken abroad and how much silver was to be left in the country to support the repeatedly devalued Chinese currency. In short, it was much like the English mercantilist system in America before 1776, only this system in the 20th century, thanks to a variety of modern inventions and vile new practices, was even more cruel, terrible and brutal than it had ever been in the earlier phase of English overseas imperialism in the 18th century.

Wilson, of course, unlike Bryan, had no objection moral or otherwise to this or any other British misdeed or systematic exploitation, but one thing Wilson did have was a burning desire to continue his assault on his now relatively helpless predecessors Teddy Roosevelt and Big Lub Bill Taft. This enduring and petty trait of Wilson's had already revealed itself ad nauseam in the dirty tactics he used against Andrew West at Princeton from 1905 to 1910, at a time when Wilson had not yet entered public service and had to make do with the heists that presented themselves to him on the relatively limited academic scene. Wilson was completely in the wrong against West. The latter was absolutely correct in arguing that Wilson's proposal to equalize the lifestyle and standard of living among students had nothing to do with advancing the cause of democracy at Princeton University, but would only cause resentment and disorder and hurt the performance of the upperclassmen. The former Princeton students, who were essential donors to the academic program of the private and non-profit Princeton University, did not buy Wilson's absurd notion that his fight against Andrew West was a fight for democracy. Although Wilson scored some temporary tactical successes, first as Princeton president and later as president of the United States, he ultimately failed in both jobs. His forced departure from Princeton was only weeks before he entered politics in New Jersey, and the unprecedented defeat of his Jimmy Cox and Frank Roosevelt-led Democratic Party in the 1920 presidential election proved how thoroughly disgusted America was with Wilson's perpetual deception and deceit. "Indeed, he had already suffered an overwhelming defeat in the 1918 congressional elections, in which he supported the Democratic candidates, at a time when the war of USA against Germany was still in progress, and he was foolish enough not to listen to George Record's advice and stay away from the Paris Peace Conference after his own country had rejected and discarded him as leader.

Japan and the USA in the Wilson era

Wilson's first attack on the China Consortium favored by Teddy and Taft was dated March 18, 1913-two weeks after his first inauguration. In particular, he accused Teddy Roosevelt of attempting to eliminate the last tattered remnants of

Chinese sovereignty. This becomes pure irony in view of the fact that six years later, Wilson was the first to personally force China to hand over its richest province, Shantung, to Japan - as a reward for Japan's participation in the First World War, which England, Japan's only ally, had neither asked for nor desired. England hoped to keep Japan out of the war so that the British could take possession of all the German colonies in the Pacific region without having to share any of the spoils with Tokyo. Japan's unilateral action against Germany in 1914, without the slightest moral or legal justification, frustrated this British plan. Japan's participation in the war was nominal at best. It lost only 300 men compared to its loss of 200,000 men in the Russo-Japanese War a decade earlier. Thanks to Wilson's personal commitment to Japan, however, the latter received more spoils in the Treaty of Versailles of 1919 than in the Portsmouth Treaty of 1905, where Teddy Roosevelt had helped Count Witte to reduce Japan's gains bit by bit²⁶ despite the huge Japanese war losses.

In the first year of his presidency, Wilson succeeded in undermining the elaborate system of loans and investments that J. P. Morgan and Harriman had built up with the diplomatic and military help of Teddy and Taft²⁶². Wilson was also the first foreign head of state to give *de jure* diplomatic recognition to the Chinese Republican National Assembly, which met for the first time in March 1913²⁶³. Wilson thus became an opponent of white imperialism in China, while at the same time favoring Japan's colored imperialism. The Japanese had become disciples of the British, and Japan's imperialism in China was almost as brutal as England's, but Wilson was unable to erase the Japanese resentment against the United States that Teddy Roosevelt had engendered, nor to earn Japan's personal gratitude.

The bicameral California state legislature - eighty representatives and forty state senators - which had acted against Chinese immigrants for the first time in the United States thirty-five years earlier, passed a law on May 2, 1913, stating that Japanese, like Chinese, were "aliens ineligible for citizenship."²⁶⁴ This was pretty much the same as the Romanian law denying citizenship to Galician Jews, which the Romanian government was forced to repeal by the Berlin Congress of 1878. This was much the same as the Romanian law denying Romanian citizenship to immigrant Galician Jews, which the Romanian government was forced to rescind by Disraeli and Bismarck at the Berlin Congress of 1878 - but Wilson told Japanese diplomats that as much as he wanted to, he could not rescind federal laws, which was exactly true. The Japanese, who, unlike the US and Germany with their federal systems, had developed a unitary state on the English model, did not believe Wilson, whom they suspected of retaliating for their piratical annexation of Korea in 1910²⁶⁵. Thus the Japanese extended their resentment of Teddy Roosevelt to Wilson throughout Wilson's presidency, and they also wrongly assumed that

Wilson's role in securing large territorial gains for Japan at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 was solely due to British diplomatic pressure. The opposite was true: Wilson persuaded the British to make grudging concessions to Japan. Not surprisingly, the Versailles Treaty provisions that were most often rebuked in the US Senate in 1919 were not the European ones - although the provisions on B Europe were recognized as bad and widely criticized - but the Asian ones, including the enormous concessions to Japan at the expense of China, which Wilson had supported. It was not until 1921 that Japanese diplomats realized how easy it was for Rarding and Hughes to persuade England to end the Anglo-Japanese alliance of nineteen years (in exchange for American naval concessions to England), and now Japan began to realize that it had been deceived by England about the role of Lloyd George and Wilson in the Japanese^s question - but by then Wilson was already mentally ill and no longer in office. Japan had been a mere tool for England in the destruction of Romanov Russia and Hohenzollern Germany. There had never been any real English sympathy for Japan, and no sooner had the purposes of the alliance been safely achieved than the English were willing to sell their Japanese alliance very cheaply.

The unprovoked interference in the European war

Regarding Wilson's deliberate machinations to promote Allied victory in World War I while the United States was technically neutral, and to thrust America into the war when the original pro-Allied Wilsonian program did not succeed, Duroselle, the patriotic Frenchman, stated with objective sincerity, "For the United States there were no direct interests involved, and the Monroe Doctrine forbade interference in European affairs."266 In 1914 and 1915, Wilson repeatedly claimed in confidential cabinet meetings that the European war represented a black, White conflict of evil against good, whereby he assigned the Germans with their high culture the role of savage barbarians and the rapacious English the role of angels - which, however, as Duroselle conclusively notes, was sheer nonsense according to Wilson's own values. After all, Wilson was avidly pro-Jewish and was the compliant tool of world Jewry. The Jews in Germany, however, were the most politically privileged in Europe, and the Germans even emancipated the Polish and Romanian Jews in the course of the war, whereas England's main ally in 1914 and 1915, Tsarist Russia, was the most anti-Jewish nation on earth 6²⁷.

Mark Sullivan²⁶⁸ has emphasized the high-handedness with which Wilson sought to bring the pluralistic USA of 1914 to the side of the British group of belligerents. Contrary to his hypocritically pious assurances, he had virtually destroyed the entire fabric of American neutrality before the end of August 1914

by having his Ambassador Page in London tell Secretary of State Grey that there would never be more than at most harmless platonic American protests at British violations of international law - an opening that shocked even the New York Times when it became known after the war. This outrageous Wilsonian betrayal of the traditional rights of neutrals, which had been a major concern of US foreign policy before 1914, was also to cost the other neutrals dearly, such as Sweden and the Netherlands,

Norway and Denmark, which had suffered much worse from British piracy at the outset than they would have had Wilson not sold out the neutrals' position from the start. During the American Revolutionary War, Catherine the Great of Russia had been the most powerful neutral, and her staunch defense of the neutrals' rights against England proved to be an advantage to the American cause. During the early stages of World War I, Wilson was the most powerful neutral, and his perverse reluctance to defend the rights of neutrals against England doomed the cause of neutrals worldwide at the very beginning. All over the world, in Europe, Latin America and the Far East, the British mistreated neutrals at will - in the comforting knowledge that Wilson, who should have been the leader of the neutrals, had sold out their cause.

The American people were not asked

In 1914, the U.S. population was 95 million-nearly half that of Czarist Russia, with its 180 million, and one-sixth that of the British Empire, with its nearly 600 million. About one-third of the American population was either foreign-born or had foreign-born parents, and as is the nature of pluralism, the overwhelming majority of all Americans maintained emotional contact and spiritual ties to one part of Europe or another. The European Irish, for example, only became open allies of Germany against Britain in World War I in the wake of the 1916 Dublin Easter Rising - which ushered in a five-year war between the British and the Irish; yet it was no secret to Wilson and other American political leaders that the Irish in the United States were almost 100 percent on the side of the Germans from the moment Britain attacked the German Empire without warning in August 1914. This is particularly significant because the Irish-American element was exceeded in its numerical contribution to the American nation only by the German-American element. In 1914, the combined English, Scottish, Welsh, Cornish and Northern Irish elements of Americans born abroad or descended from foreign-born parents made up only slightly more than half of the Irish-American element.

share and far less than a third of the German share - a total of only 20 percent of the combined German-Irish share²⁶

As everyone knew, there were very few people of Japanese, Russian or French descent in the United States in 1914. In this state of affairs, it is scientifically proven that Wilson, in 1914, in trying to get the country to take sides in a foreign war, was in contradiction to the deepest and most sacred convictions of the American people as a whole. And when the autocrat by his own grace Wilson continually uttered the slippery word democracy - as Stalin later did - it was a blatant insult to the intelligence of the average American. No politician harbored more contempt or hatred for democracy than Wilson, who secretly handed over complete dictatorial power over the United States to Bernard Baruch during the war. Quite apart from that, Porter Sargent was undoubtedly correct in his assertion that the only real democracy in the world is to be found in tiny socio-economic and political units, such as the Hindu village in India or the traditional Yankee village in New England.

The USA was never a democracy

To speak of the United States as a whole as a democracy, as Wilson incessantly did, was a crude attack on the US Constitution of 1787, which Wilson had never agreed to. The only point on which all fifty-five delegates to the Constitutional Convention of Philadelphia in 1787 had agreed was that democracy was the worst of all forms of government in the world for a country of more than five hundred people, and that it must be the ultimate goal of the convention, to create a permanent American political system that would be thoroughly anti-democratic on the basis of Montesquieu and his separation of powers theory and would contain enough dictatorial and oligarchic elements to bring down once and for all any political effort at democracy. The Founding Fathers were extremely successful in realizing this goal, as the US has remained anti-democratic to this day.

Admittedly, many shallow American court historians seeking to justify the willful lying of Woody Wilson and Frank Roosevelt have confused two things: the doctrine of socioeconomic democracy (meaning the lifting of restrictions on entrepreneurial activity as described by Frederick List to German audiences at the time of US President Andrew Jackson, based on his own experience) and the doctrine of political democracy, which the Founding Fathers abhorred. But the one had absolutely nothing to do with the other. Until the age of Woody Wilson and Frank Roosevelt, every educated person called the American political system an independent republic, not a democracy. Certainly, the French aristocrat Alexis de Tocqueville used the term democracy both in the title and in

the text of his brilliant and frank critique²⁷⁰ of the USA during Jackson's presidency. All in all, negative and positive statements about the USA are almost in balance. It must be remembered, however, that just as Tacitus' "Germania" was primarily aimed at reforming Rome, or Voltaire's "Letters on the English" mainly at French reforms, Tocqueville - who never advocated political democracy for either France or the USA - was merely trying to make the minds of the French upper classes more receptive to Louis Philippe's more flexible socio-economic system instead of the previous class system of the Bourbons Louis XVIII and Charles X.

Wilson overrides the will of the people

To anyone seriously interested in studying Tocqueville, it is clear that the French aristocrat did not intend a Wilsonian-style crusade for a non-existent political democracy, but a serious and practical discussion of the social, economic and cultural aspects of America and Europe at the moment when these two continents were entering the advanced stage of the Western Industrial Revolution and the Modern Age. One cannot salvage the reputation of a morbid charlatan like Wilson by distorting the work and intent of an outstanding French historian who died in 1859, before the American Civil War. ¹⁰Wilson's democratic claptrap does not mitigate the grave crimes against humanity he committed when he inflicted excessive suffering on his own people and millions of Europeans by becoming a violent partisan in 1914 in a conflict to which the overwhelming majority of Americans, regardless of their ethnic European ties, favored strict neutrality.

Add to this the fact that far more Americans had ethnic and emotional ties to the Central Powers and their friends than to the Allies of World War I, and the blatant nature of Wilson's crime against humanity becomes apparent. It took a Frank Roosevelt to surpass Wilson's villainy twenty years later. None of Roosevelt's post-1945 successors in the White House-as selfish, destructive, irascible, and irresponsible as they all were-achieved the same level of wickedness as Wilson, the champion of villainy, and Frank Roosevelt, his most devoted and even more diabolical disciple.

Wilson successfully deceived the American people until his re-election in 1916 because he was willing to stoop to any means of deception and misinformation. A good example was his public call on August 18, 1914, for "neutrality in thought as well as deed." ^{27\} Mark Sullivan offered the amusing example of an old-style American waiting for a shave in a barbershop in 1914, while the barbers - one group born in England, France, Serbia and Russia, the other in Germany, Austria, Ireland and Hungary - excitedly swung their terrible

razors at each other in a heated argument before serving the next customer. Their anger and desperation were such that the old American couldn't decide which of these excited barbers he could let shave him without risk. There is no doubt that Wilson had a special reverence for Jewish Bolshevism, which received decisive help from him in 1917, for Bolshevism also insisted on telling people not only what to do but also what to think.

William Bryan and the 1916 Democratic Convention

The only pro-German politician Wilson temporarily tolerated in his cabinet was his Secretary of State, William J. Bryan, whom House Wilson had convinced that his continued support was essential to a successful reelection campaign in 1916. Bryan was very active as the nominal head of the federal Democratic Party and as a successful speaker at the Chautauqua Lectures. Bryan missed many cabinet meetings, and in those meetings alone where Bryan was not present, Wilson vented his passionate loyalty to British imperialism, calling the Germans great barbaric beasts.

Until Bryan's resignation in 1915, Wilson made every effort to appear to Bryan as a fair-minded proponent of a peaceful American foreign policy, and it served him well that Teddy Roosevelt - who had been seething with rage ever since he had become the prime target of Wilson's domestic attacks in 1913 - called him a wimpy pacifist in the critical election year of 1916. It was a period of great excitement, but a little reflection should have helped Bryan realize that a man who had spent four years hectoring the Mexican people could hardly accurately be described as a wimpy pacifist. The rest was taken care of by Martin Glynn from New York, who gave the programmatic speech at the 1916 Democratic convention in St. Louis. An extremely popular song had spread throughout the USA before the start of the party convention: "I didn't raise my boy to be a Soldier! (I didn't raise my boy to be a soldier!)" This song did not so much reflect a non-existent general American pacifism, but arose from global disgust at the huge British losses on the Somme and the French and German losses in 1916 at the Battle of Verdun, which remains to this day the greatest and deadliest military combat action in that world history which Hegel called the slaughterhouse of humanity. Glynn's programmatic speech was skillful, simple and direct. He listed numerous crises in American history, and among them - as in the history of every nation - there were many in which the United States avoided war. He then cited the victories for peace. Bryan had been so sure that he would oppose Wilson in the 1916 presidential campaign that he did not even attend the convention as a delegate, but only as a newspaper reporter from the press gallery, where he sat when Glynn spoke. His rhetoric reminded Bryan of

his own, and tears of joy ran down his cheeks as Glynn listed the victories for peace.

Wilson was outraged and dismayed by this display of pacifism by the majority of the convention that had gathered to re-nominate him for the presidency. House, however, wily as ever, advised Wilson that "He kept us out of war!" was a far more effective slogan for victory at the polls than the slogan Wilson favored, "Military preparedness! " While Bryan was forever cured of wishing for another term under Wilson, he abruptly pivoted to actively support Wilson's candidacy, as did the remaining anti-English Democrats who had originally wanted to oppose Wilson. By following House's advice on the slogan issue, Wilson not only willfully deceived Bryan once again - as he had in 1912 - but was also guilty of completely deceiving the American public in two presidential campaigns in a row. Wilson pretended to be a progressive in 1912, which he never was, and he played the disinterested friend of world peace in 1916, which he also never was. He was no friend of genuine American neutrality in the First World War. On the contrary: he himself had secretly and deliberately destroyed genuine neutrality in the early days of the war. The whole war in Europe would have been over long before the American choice of

would have ended if Wilson had not destroyed the de facto neutrality of the USA in August 1914.

Colonel House's European mission

Wilson had sent House to Europe before the outbreak of World War I, although it was hard to imagine a man more prejudiced in favor of England and against Germany. House's father had been a blockade runner in Texas during the Civil War, working for both England and the American South. Although House flaunted the title of colonel - which, of course, was only an honorary title bestowed on him by a Texas governor because of his wealth - he was not a colonel. Governor because of his wealth - no member of House's family had ever completed a single day of regular military service, and Kaiser Wilhelm II would probably never have made the mistake of inviting House to German maneuvers if his diplomats in the USA had told him this fact. In his reports to the equally biased Wilson, House made it seem as if all Germans thirsted for war, and he added the absurd claim that Admiral v. Tirpitz - the educated, measured and brilliant head of the German navy whom House met in Berlin in late spring 1914 - was "the most aggressive German "272^ To forestall the unlikely possibility that Wilson might one day take a liking to Kaiser Wilhelm II - as Teddy Roosevelt did after meeting the Kaiser in Berlin in 1910 - House told Wilson that the Kaiser reminded him of Teddy Roosevelt. House admitted that

the Kaiser approved of the late Cecil Rhodes' formula for an American-English-German understanding, but argued that this was not due to any real commitment on the Kaiser's part to world peace, but rather to secure his own ambitions in Europe. In fact, this very real commitment to peace was the only motive that prompted the Emperor to favor the coming together of the three powers described by House²⁷³^

House stayed very briefly in Paris and then hurried on to London to denounce and slander the Emperor to the English. As an excuse for his all-too-brief stay in Paris, he used the tensions that existed between the coalition of reconciliation with Germany under Caillaux and Jaures and the coalition of blind faith in the success of British imperialism under Poincare and Viviani. Paris would have been the best place to mediate and inform - had House's zeal for European peace been genuine, which it was not. Germany was firmly in favor of maintaining peace, England just as firmly in favor of starting the war, and France found itself politically almost torn to pieces in June 1914 by the magnetic pull of these diametrically opposed German and British views. House did nothing in Paris to reinforce the view that the Kaiser and his government were in favor of genuine and lasting peace. As it happened, House did not visit Russia, Austria-Hungary or Italy at all and, apart from a few days in Germany and a day in France, spent his entire so-called peace mission in England, where he merely slandered the Kaiser and described Wilson's fervent support for every step of British imperialism, however reprehensible, and agitated for war. Most recently, beginning on June 10, 1914, he "spoke at length with Edward Grey"²⁷⁴

The conversations with Grey became even longer and more interesting after June 28, the day Serbian fanatics assassinated the Habsburg heir to the throne and his wife in Sarajevo. House traveled back to the United States in July 1914 with the knowledge that British policy would almost certainly bring about war. War broke out shortly after House arrived at the White House. Woody Wilson claimed to his cabinet in Bryan's absence that ninety percent of the American people favored an Allied victory. An estimate of ten percent would have been more accurate had Wilson been motivated and inspired by truth rather than devotion to the myth of Anglo-Saxon greatness²⁷⁵.

The outbreak of war in Europe;
Wilson's feigned neutrality

Now that Wilsonian America's support was assured in advance, one could expect an unprecedented excess of the inhuman, barbaric tactics that had accompanied every modern British war of aggression - now that Secretary of

State Grey had succeeded in pushing Russia, France and Britain into war against Germany. Colonel House had reported to Wilson weeks before the Sarajevo crisis that the encircling alliance would march on a signal from London. The price for Grey at home was only two indignant resignations from the London Cabinet, those of Morley and Burns. London announced Cabinet orders on August 20, 1914 - the day German troops invaded Brussels - that revealed the long-held official British intention to starve the German civilian population by unlawful means. As one of their many illegalities, the British classified foodstuffs as military goods liable to confiscation if transported on neutral ships - a flagrant breach of the Konterbande Act and prevailing international laws of naval warfare²⁷⁶.

President Wilson, as the supposedly civilized leader of the world's most powerful neutral nation, would have had a duty to follow the example of Czarina Catherine of Russia. The latter organized an alliance of neutral trading states during the American War of Independence in 1775-1783 to oppose, by force if necessary, the usual rampant violations of the law of the sea in wartime that had always characterized British practice since the days of Hawkins, Drake and Queen Elizabeth I in the 16th century, known to European contemporaries as the Pirate Queen. Instead of choosing the path of duty that honorable and decent American leaders like Bryan, LaFollette or Champ Clark would have followed, Wilson secretly authorized his close friend and American ambassador to London, Walter H. Page, to promise Secretary of State Grey that Wilson would place no real obstacles in the way of British crimes under international law, and that formal American protests against blatant British misdeeds alone should lead the Germans and the American public to believe that the United States was trying to be neutral, and that Page - an editor by profession with ample experience in deliberately deceiving the American public - would help Grey respond as effectively as possible to any U.S. State Department protest for American psychology.

Grey willingly went along with it. It was a deal that even the New York Times admitted after the war would not only have long been sufficient for Page's dismissal in disgrace, but also - if made public in time - would have provided a broad legal basis for impeachment and conviction of President Woody Wilson for treason and offenses against the American people²⁷⁷.

The British fleet, with silent American consent, began to seize neutral ships destined for neutral ports under the pretext that their cargoes were indirectly destined for Germany. The British expanded their false counterfeit list of items subject to seizure beyond anything previously seen. As if that were not enough, the British blockade of Germany did not meet the legal requirements, for the British fleet was not strong enough in the face of German counter-pressure to maintain close surveillance of the German coast, which was the sine qua non for

any legal blockade under the prevailing law of naval warfare, which had been established in Paris in 1856 and confirmed in London in 1909.

Wilson's and FDR's war policies -
an eerie parallel

In short, the British conduct of war in August 1914, de facto sanctioned by Woody Wilson, was closely akin to the methods of certain 18th century buccaneers, but had nothing in common with the military policy and strategy of a civilized 20th century nation. This British foray into the realm of international crime was passionately supported by Woody Wilson because Wilson despised so-called democracy and favored oligarchic plutocratic dictatorship. This is best illustrated by the fact that, like Roosevelt in 1937, he knowingly and deliberately pursued a foreign policy that was at odds with at least ninety percent of his own people.

The concept introduced by George Washington and endorsed by Bob LaFollette, that the President of the United States was elected to represent the people just like every member of Congress, and that he was not mysteriously endowed with some special divine dictatorial right to rule over subjects, was anathema to Woody Wilson and likewise to his most devoted disciple Frank Roosevelt. Wilson's role model remained the unscrupulous English Pluto oligarchs who came to power after the overthrow of their sovereign King James II in 1690 and have remained in power with meaningless changes to this day - as members of the powerful London Clubs and as self-appointed guardians of English sovereignty²⁷ 8. Thirty years before the First World War, Wilson publicly declared that these arrogant English leaders were in the right if they did not allow the House of Commons to have a say in the vital question of war and peace. Grey could never have brought about World War I if he had had to consult the Commons, and Grey had no doubt when Page told him that Wilson would immediately enter the war as England's ally if the people of the United States were not overwhelmingly opposed and if there were a way - legal or illegal - for Wilson to bypass Congress altogether with its right to decide on any American declaration of war.

So it was when Frank Roosevelt told Robert Sherwood and his other ghostwriters in 1939 that he would be in the war immediately as England's ally without the cursed impediment of Congress with its right to vote down any presidential request for a declaration of war - and both Wilson and Roosevelt knew that the close vote on the war question in 1812 had nearly broken the country. Wilson in 1914 and Roosevelt in 1939, both craving bloodshed - it was like a historical vicious spiral, but both were temporarily stopped, certainly not

by moral scruples alien to these leaders, but by the practical obstacle of the US Congress, which, though hopelessly corrupt, in both 1914 and 1939, was very mindful that the American people were overwhelmingly reluctant to enter a war as an ally of England - the same England that had on many occasions made the greatest efforts to destroy the United States during its first century of existence.

England's secret ally

In 1914, Germany was the main trading partner for cotton exports for the entire southern United States, but British Foreign Secretary Grey, ever mindful of the fact that he had Wilson's full backing, did not hesitate to place the non-military commodity of cotton on the so-called British list of absolute contraband of August 20, 1914. The ensuing howls of rage from the US South neither surprised nor bothered Grey. Grey's American servant, President Wilson, was one from the American South, and it was his business to placate the South with a series of bombastic diplomatic protests to England - all of a harmless platonic nature and no cause for alarm to Grey before he threw them in the wastepaper basket. Copies of these platonic protests remained in the hands of US Ambassador Page. Grey had accepted Page's offer to answer them all on behalf of England. Grey, who had been guilty of crimes against his own people and against world peace from the day he took office in the British Foreign Office, was given every conceivable encouragement by both Wilson and Page to commit a myriad of new crimes that would forever make an empty mockery and hopeless fraud of the whole complex and cumbersome system of modern international law^{2so}.

Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, the British ambassador in Washington/D. C., was a close friend and former sporting partner of Teddy Roosevelt, but knew as well as anyone about Woody's antipathy towards Teddy and entertained Wilson with malicious stories based on his intimate knowledge of the ex-president²⁸¹. The British cut all German undersea cables to the US in the first days of the war and then set about filling the often gullible and naïve Americans with wildly distorting anti-German atrocity propaganda. Soon after the outbreak of war in 1914, it became apparent that the U.S. mass media - corrupt as ever, and totally aligned with England - was feeding the American public a fabricated version of the First World War. This was no mean feat given the almost total ignorance of most Americans about the situation in Europe. Secretary of State Bryan felt it was necessary to go on a fact-finding trip to Europe himself to penetrate the British fog, but Wilson seized on the idea, forbade Bryan to go and sent the Anglo-Jewish liar-in-chief Colonel House instead in January 1915. This brings to mind the disastrous mission undertaken by Under-Secretary of State Sumner

Welles - a notoriously homosexual leftist and admirer of Bolshevism and Zionism - on behalf of Frank Roosevelt at the end of 1939. Welles lied to Hitler about American policy and attempted to divide Mussolini and Hitler by intimidating the Italians, who were still neutral at the time.

Not surprisingly, House sent home reports that - aside from gloating over the incipient horrors of the British blockade and the suffering it was inflicting on women, children and the elderly in Germany - trumped even the falsehoods of the British propaganda liars. House was - like Wilson, Baruch and Frank Roosevelt - a non-military man who loved modern warfare and the suffering it inflicted on combatants and civilians alike. He stayed overseas for more than five months in 1915 and was able to triumphantly reassure Wilson that Grey and the British government would ignore or reject all German offers of a compromise peace. The British aim was to hold out indefinitely until the final destruction of modern Germany. In 1915, official England considered it a mistake not to have intervened militarily and diplomatically against Bismarck when he united Germany during the 1860s and 1870s. The intention was to make up for the mistake by destroying the whole edifice of Bismarckian Germany - with the help of the USA, which had become indispensable to the Anglo-French war effort in 1915.

House was delighted by the bellicose attitude of the British. He knew that Wilson had excellent prospects of openly bringing the United States into a protracted war against Germany, and he encouraged Wilson to continue deceiving the American people as the only way to accomplish this goal. Taking this advice was never difficult for Wilson, as deception was the main ingredient of his political career²⁸²

The V-boat question

Meanwhile, after much hesitation, Germany reluctantly decided to use the submarine as the most effective weapon of retaliation against the illegal British blockade. Any retaliation against blatant illegalities of the British kind was legitimate. On February 4, 1915, Berlin declared the waters directly bordering the United Kingdom to be a combat zone. Enemy ships in this area would be sunk without warning, and neutral ships would sail there at their own risk. Although the USA protested immediately, the first American-German incident did not occur until May 7, 1915, when the British Cunard auxiliary cruiser "Lusitania" was sunk with the loss of 128 Americans (among a total of 1198 dead).

The British government had observed the prevailing law of nations in 1904 when it announced that British citizens traveled to the Russo-Japanese combat zone at their own risk; Wilson, however, secretly bent on war against Germany at any cost, acted as if the protection of American lives against Germany in the

war zone was his personal sacred duty, over the objection of his Secretary of State, Bryan. In this way, Wilson again revealed that his contempt for international law was no less than his contempt for domestic laws in the United States. Although British submarines sank twice as many neutral ships in the Baltic Sea during World War I as the German V-boats in the North Sea, Channel, Atlantic and Mediterranean, Wilson's censorship was so complete from the beginning that British sinkings of Swedish or other neutral ships were not allowed to appear in the U.S. press, and the facts only became known after the war. Swedish-Americans who reported such incidents during the war were generally not believed. Wilson knew full well that the British submarine warfare was far more destructive to neutral trade than the German, but he helped to keep the American public ignorant by forbidding American merchant ships to sail in the Baltic, while encouraging them to use British waters while carrying Americans in as large numbers as possible.

Wilson was aware that the submarine issue was as phony a pretext for war as the slavery issue had been two generations earlier as a pretext for Northern aggression against the South in the American Civil War, and yet he lied in public about the submarine issue as much as he could to make it a palatable reason for war. This worked so well for Wilson that Frank Roosevelt "1941 tried to get a second war against Germany using the submarine. Roosevelt's effort, which was accompanied by a torrent of deliberate lies, was unsuccessful because a flood of post-1918 literature in the U.S. had brought to light the sham and fraud of Wilson's feigned neutrality policy during the thirty-two months leading up to the official U.S. entry into the war284^

Wilson did not object when, on July 19, 1916, London published a list of eighty-seven American export companies that had allegedly "aided the Central Powers "285^ With Wilson's tacit acquiescence, these American companies were placed on the extensive British blacklist, and the purchase of their products by British citizens ceased immediately, while the British fleet confiscated all of these companies' products, without exception, to the extent that it could get hold of them on the high seas286^

A presidential election without a real alternative

As in all other American presidential elections of the 20th century - except that of 1920 - foreign policy was not allowed to become a point of contention in the 1916 election, and this was achieved by the fact that the plutocratic evildoers of the USA managed to oppose Charles E. Hughes as the Anglophile Republican candidate against the Anglophile Democrat Wilson287^ For the frustrated American voters who were unable to break through the corrupt

nominating system of the party conventions - which dictated the selection of presidential candidates at will from small, smoke-filled rooms and then made meaningless noise about them in large, open convention halls, open convention halls-for these American voters, 1916 was just another typical presidential election with no real issues of any kind-foreign or domestic-between the two ostensibly opposing candidates, who in reality were J. P. Morgan and J. D. Morgan. P. Morgan and J. D. Rockefeller were in cahoots. The latter two men had decided long before the official election campaign, with its faux pacifist theme, that official U.S. entry into the war was an absolute necessity to ensure profits for the Morgan and Rockefeller loans to the Allies. Every party election in the Soviet Union since 1917 offered the Soviet electorate as much choice as the US electorate had in the 1916 presidential election.

Whether more or fewer American voters went to the polls was irrelevant. The decades-long shenanigans of American presidential elections had caused voter turnout to plummet from 90 percent of eligible voters in 1856 to just 55 percent sixty years later, in 1916. Whether Wilson or Hughes was elected had no more effect on the outcome of the campaign, which was predetermined by the few men with real power, than the turnout of Soviet voters would have had on the re-election of Brezhnev and the CPSU list candidates sixty years later. The outcome of 1916 would have been very different had the Republicans been allowed to field a decent progressive candidate; but the leaders of that movement from LaFollette on down had been so viciously vilified by the American mass media in far-flung Europe after the outbreak of the war that it was a gimmick for the evil-doers to foist a corrupt and easily distractible candidate like Hughes on the Republicans.

For those political observers who have studied Hughes's disgraceful role in the 1916 presidential campaign, twenty-one years later, when he was serving as Chief Justice, his betrayal of the Supreme Court by Frank Roosevelt and his lawless Red New Deal horde came as no surprise, especially after Roosevelt's overwhelming victory over Alf Landon in the 1936 presidential election. Like Republican presidential candidate Thomas Dewey twenty-eight years later, Hughes in 1916 falsely enjoyed the reputation of a genuine reformer simply because he had exposed some racketeering in the New York utilities while working to build his political reputation and conceal his lifelong ties to the mainstream American plutocrats. Those who knew Hughes in 1916 and 1937 knew that he was generally corrupt, and were equally aware that he had been strongly anti-religious despite having devout parents, and was also a crass materialist and moral relativist from an early age²⁸⁸.

Wilson betrays the emperor

When Wilson broke his solemn Sussex promise to Kaiser Wilhelm, for

which Germany had paid heavily in advance even before the election, and when he did not support an international peace initiative after his successful presidential re-election in November 1916 - although he had promised Germany that he would - the German government took its own unilateral peace initiative (December 12, 1916). It made the offer of a reconciliatory peace between equals without any annexations. All this was openly expressed in a Reichstag speech by the Imperial Chancellor von Bethmann-Hollweg.

Wilson dangled Bethmann's peace initiative like a bad finger in front of the gawking public. Not only did he refuse to lend any support to the honorable and decent offer, but a short week later-before the Allies had taken any public notice of the German peace plan-he had Robert Lansing, his newly appointed and ardently Anglo- phile Secretary of State, tell London that if only the Allies would summon the strength to reject the fair and generous German offer, he-Wilson, in gratitude-would quickly lead the United States into the war on the Allied side, now that he had the presidential re-election safely in his pocket. A more contemptible and blatant breach of a solemn promise could not possibly be imagined. In the end, the Allies did their disgraceful friend a favor, and the enthusiastic Wilson sent a public message to the US Senate on January 22, 1917, informing them that it was his personal decision that the "United States would guarantee future peace"29o,

In this way, Wilson publicly and unilaterally committed the US to war - eleven weeks before your formal entry into the war based on the vote of Congress, and he did it a dozen days before Germany, in response to breaking the Sussex Pledge, resumed the unrestricted submarine warfare it had stopped nearly a year earlier at a high price as part of the Sussex Pledge. This unprecedented Wilsonian arrogance was copied exactly by Frank Roosevelt at his Atlantic Charter meeting with Winston Churchill in Canadian waters in August 1941. Roosevelt publicly committed the USA to war and to responsibility for the coming peace, sixteen weeks before the Japanese invasion.

He struck Pearl Harbor in response to his blockade of the Japanese Empire, but already after he had imposed this blockade, which made war inevitable, in July 1941. This is a perfect parallel of nefariousness, with Roosevelt's successful criminal policy of 1941 clearly being a consequence of Wilson's policy of 1917, and all the more so because Frank Roosevelt remained a disciple of Wilson in all things throughout his life. Seen from this correct perspective, the entire worldwide imperialism of the USA, which reached its peak in the years immediately after 1945, is based exclusively on crimes and deception towards the American people at home and towards the community of peoples outside.

Frank Roosevelt, the super Wilson

As soon as the Allies, under Wilson's pressure, rejected the fair German peace offer of December 12, 1916, Wilson knew he had his war. Frank Roosevelt knew he had his war when he was able to announce his piratical blockade of Japan in July 1941 without incurring a presidential impeachment and condemnation he so richly deserved.

Both men were war criminals of rampant arrogance who also despised the alleged stupidity of their contemporaries too much not to brazenly flaunt the war policies they had decided to pursue long before the US Congress granted them formal cloaks of legality to do so. Both US entries into the war against Germany (1917 and 1941) were classic examples of international crimes and offenses against humanity of the worst kind. The euphoria that dominated Frank Roosevelt was accurately captured by George Crocker²⁹¹. There was, for example, Roosevelt's habit of talking publicly about "Britain, Russia and I (they!)"^{2^} Roosevelt had acquired this egotistic mindset during his involvement in the Wilson regime, when the President - while the US was still neutral - dictated to the US Senate exactly what the US should do in future international treaty negotiations, despite the Senate's exclusive power of assent to all international treaties.

Not even Teddy Roosevelt's bluster, bragging and brutal posturing had prepared the world or the USA for Wilson's supreme arrogance, which was later imitated to perfection by Frank Roosevelt. It is therefore no wonder that Wilson took a beating at the ballot box when the war was still going on in 1918, that he lost his battle with the Senate in 1919 and that his entire foreign and domestic policy was rejected by the American electorate in the 1920 presidential election.

Wilson was too much even for the downtrodden and abused American public - a public that had traditionally been badly mistreated - and it took enormous effort and energy on the part of the U.S. Jewish mass media from 1930 onward - along with the indispensable *deus ex machina* of the unprecedented total American market collapse of 1929 plus their recklessly false smear campaign against President Hoover - to make a portion of the American public to lose its faith in the traditional American attitudes that Wilson had disregarded, to chastise itself for its earlier rejection of Wilson, and to turn blindly to the pathologically criminal leadership of Frank Roosevelt, the super-cynic and super-Wilson. Frank Roosevelt, in the sober judgment of Crocker, a distinguished lawyer and historian and the most brilliant commentator on American journalism in the 20th century²⁹³, did more damage to the United States and the entire world than any other leader in history, not excluding Woodrow Wilson, Winston Churchill and Josef Stalin²⁹⁴.

Duroselle's observation that Wilson's neutrality from 1914 to 1917 only concealed diplomatic and economic realities and was by no means genuine, any more than Roosevelt's neutrality from 1939 to 1941. Duroselle cites a telling statistic, namely that during the first two and a half years of World War I, American trade with the Allies was thirty times greater than that with the Central Powers, and this despite the large German financial investment in the United States, the evasion of merchant ships from the blockade to the Mediterranean and elsewhere, and the operation of German merchant V-boats in the Atlantic. No real neutrality could last on the basis of such a one-sided trade, even if Wilson had been less unscrupulous, ruthless and criminal in his methods. Duroselle, the objective French historian, gave his final judgment in the careful and masterly understatement that the German "complaint was understandable"295 .

Bryan tried from the beginning to oppose Wilson's policy of unlimited loans to England and France, but he was soon outmaneuvered by Wilson and forced to withdraw from the presidential cabinet. After Bryan left, Wilson was able to accelerate his non-neutral policy without being hindered in any way by the Cabinet, thanks to the appointments once recommended by Colonel House. Wilson perversely insisted that England was fighting the battle for world civilization, and no one after Bryan's departure was permitted to express the slightest sympathy or even interest in the plight and sufferings of the Central Powers. These, Wilson claimed, were the nations of barbaric beasts. England's own leading historian, Arnold Toynbee, had publicly declared in 1915 that the greatest losses to world civilization were in the German trenches2^.

America's millionaires finance the Entente

Wilson's Secretary of the Treasury during the period of false American neutrality was William McAdoo. He was also Wilson's cynical son-in-law: although almost as old as Wilson, he had married one of the president's three daughters2^ McAdoo made no objections when the J. P. Morgan Company announced a few months after the outbreak of the First World War that it had become "an intermediary between the French government and American businessmen"298. In January 1915, J. P. Morgan issued a 450 million dollar loan to France against Bryan's opposition, but with the full approval of Wilson and his son-in-law McAdoo. In August 1915, the Federal Reserve Board, egged on by McAdoo, organized its "general credit system" for the Allies-the final step that made the eventual U.S. entry into the war inevitable, regardless of

submarines and similar minor issues²⁹⁹.

By the time Wilson entered the war in 1917, the USA had lent England and France 23000000000 dollars - nothing to Germany - and this sum for the Allies was worth at least 30 billion dollars in later American currency. This was blood money that not only provided the means to prolong the war and tear to pieces hundreds of thousands of German soldiers who had already suffered British aggression and were never hostile to the United States - it was also blood money that demanded total German defeat and dismemberment, complete Allied victory and further expansion of British imperialism. It was money made available with Wilson's approval, who mimed the disinterested philanthropist but, in addition to his own military aggression since 1913, excused every atrocity and crime committed by British imperialism.

Although Wilson had slightly reduced the unnecessarily high annual US naval budget in 1913, he used the sinking of the Lusitania as an excuse to reverse this policy and initiate a huge general US military expansion program. The US Army General Staff, under Wilson's constant urging, completed a precise plan in September 1915 - just a year after Britain had unleashed the First World War - to send one and a half million American soldiers to fight under British commanders on the Western Front in the war of annihilation against Germany³⁰⁰. Spending on the US Navy in 1915 exceeded anything that had ever been requested by Teddy Roosevelt, and on August 29, 1916, shortly after the start of the war, the US Navy's budget was increased. On August 29, 1916, shortly after the start of the huge British offensive on the Somme (which had been made possible solely by the enormous American supplies of artillery, grenades, machine guns, flamethrowers, hand grenades, trucks, rifles, pistols and billions of rounds of ammunition to England), Wilson persuaded a corrupt Congressional majority to pass a bill for a huge new naval buildup that would ensure that the Atlantic would be littered with American naval units, thus realizing Wilson's fixed idea that the U.S. would have to play the decisive role in destroying the German submarine fleet³⁰¹.

Wilson's Mexican adventure

In the meantime, Huerta's Mexican military dictatorship had consolidated in October 1913, all internal resistance to Huerta had ceased, and the peace that had lasted under the Diaz dictatorship from 1877 to 1911 had been restored. Huerta encountered no difficulties when he persuaded England and the other European powers to recognize his stable regime de jure³⁰². Only Wilson and his Jewish advisors were determined to bring about new bloodshed on a considerable scale in peaceful Mexico - which had often been the victim of US

military aggression. As a first step, Wilson was determined to eliminate Huerta, so he organized a puppet government in a lonely, wild area of northern Mexico under Venustiano Carranza, a former personal friend of the dead Francisco Madero, who had been martyred in the conspiracy masterminded by U.S. Ambassador H. L. Wilson. Wilson wanted to use Carranza against Huerta from the US border, just as the USA had used Juarez against Emperor Maximilian. Wilson had far more arms and ammunition flowing across the border for Carranza in a matter of months than was available in all of Mexico's state arsenals, but what Wilson did not realize was this: that Carranza, an ambitious Mexican politician, hated the United States for the murder of his friend Madero and probably happily received the mass of war materiel that the bloodthirsty Wilson pushed to him, but had no intention of remaining Wilson's puppet until he had all the political and military means of power within Mexico in his handsJoJ.

While Carranza was busily practicing his illegal American Marionette partisans, Wilson decided to directly promote the impending coup by inflicting an intolerable public humiliation on Huerta. It was easy for Wilson to pick a direct quarrel with Huerta, who never dared to prohibit American warships from entering and leaving Mexican ports at will, with drunken American sailors on shore leave raping and otherwise molesting Mexican women of the "Greaser" race they despised. When, in connection with one such incident, a couple of U.S. sailors in Tarnpico were briefly detained by the authorities there, Wilson angrily demanded not only an unwarranted payment for damages, but also a twenty-one-gun salute by Mexico for the American flag without an American response for the flag of Mexico. This was a ruthless demand by Wilson, aimed at convincing the proud Mexicans that their country was not sovereign, but merely a meaningless colony of the United States, where American military force was the law and Mexican law counted for nothing. Because Huerta would have been murdered had he complied with Wilson's insane and vile demand, he had no choice but to refuse, but he offered Wilson a host of other Mexican concessions that did not so blatantly contradict the principle of Mexican sovereignty. Wilson, however, as Huerta had feared, rejected Mexico's servile compliance on all points - except the unilateral flag salute - and (like Harry Truman in Korea in 1950) sent the United States armed forces into war without congressional approval. Wilson issued his outrageous and disgraceful war order on April 22, 1914, more than three months before England unleashed World War I304.

In the course of the military operations that began, the American forces took Mexico's second largest city, Vera Cruz, after Huerta's troops had put up unsuccessful resistance there. The hypocritical American apostles of humanity were appalled by the filth and poverty typical of this proletarian port city on the Gulf of Mexico. They didn't like the fact that the Mexicans habitually dumped their garbage on the street, knowing that the giant vultures that infested the area would soon carry it away anyway. Under the proclaimed martial law, the Americans immediately banned this form of garbage disposal on pain of death, without the slightest concern for what the mighty birds would eat when their garbage service was over. Although the vultures of Vera Cruz had not previously harassed humans, the starvation imposed by the U.S. drove them to desperation, and they now carried off and devoured countless Mexican babies and young children. The US Navy decided and probably killed a few of the big birds, but they were clever, switched to night-time operation and were never completely eradicated.

Wilson was delighted with the effectiveness of his invasion. Huerta finally capitulated to the combined forces of the USA and Carranza. On August 20, 1914 - the day the Germans took Brussels and England announced the details of its blockade of Germany - Carranza, the new dictator of Mexico, held his own victory parade in Mexico City. Expecting Carranza to bounce better than Huerta when he cracked his whip, Wilson was stunned when, after his victory parade, Carranza publicly demanded that American forces immediately evacuate all of Mexico. Instead of winning an unqualified victory as expected, Wilson had replaced Huerta with Carranza alone, at great cost to Mexico and great cost to the US - a man far more agile and much more averse to the US than Huerta, who would have more readily accepted a dominant American economic imperialism in Mexico.

Wilson reacted immediately by trying to destroy Carranza in the same way he had finished off Huerta. To do so, he used every dirty trick in his arsenal. He bribed one of Carranza's subordinates, Francisco Pancho Villa, to betray Carranza and become head of a fourth Mexican puppet regime under US auspices in four years. Although Villa was originally only an illiterate shepherd, he had unusual strategic and tactical military skills and certainly possessed far more of both than any of Wilson's own officers (not to mention those who had remained loyal to Carranza). Wilson was proud to have made a very wise move in purchasing Villa.

American military supplies now flowed to Villa, who organized an illegal partisan army in northern Mexico and made a pact in southern Mexico with Emilio Zapata, an Indian regional partisan leader reminiscent of Benito Juarez in the early stages of his career. Wilson, thinking he had Villa in his pocket, coolly rebuffed Carranza's request for diplomatic recognition by the US. Then,

when Wilson suddenly pulled the rug from under Carranza's feet, his regime quickly collapsed, but with renewed bloodshed throughout Mexico. Carranza's situation became so desperate that at one point he was forced to seek temporary refuge behind American lines in the Mexican tidelands on the coast of the Gulf of Mexico after his attempt to defend the Mexican capital against encirclement by Villa and Zapata failed miserably. Duroselle is undoubtedly correct in stating that the new round of the Mexican Civil War "could undoubtedly have been avoided by immediate recognition of Carranza" 306.

Wilson's game with Carranza and Villa

Eighty percent of the Mexican population in 1914 was illiterate. It would be an understatement to add that the people of Mexico were in some disarray as to the nature and ultimate goals of American imperialism in Mexico. Wilson had condemned the Mexican policies of his predecessors Teddy Roosevelt and Bill Taft, but then quickly withdrew his support from Huerta's enemy Carranza and turned it to Villa, who betrayed Carranza. The confusion became complete when Villa aroused Wilson's ire by demanding that the U.S. respect the integrity of the remaining Mexican territory. American forces remained in Mexico, after all, and the US had already annexed over half of Mexico since it had gained independence from Spain. Now, in a fit of resentment, Wilson suddenly withdrew his aid from Villa and began supporting Carranza again.

Wilson ended Villa's military supplies and handed over such huge amounts of arms and money to Carranza that the latter's military victory in April 1915 became inevitable, despite the skill of Villa's brilliant military leadership. Carranza came to the realization that Wilson was insane and had no idea of the conditions and history of Mexico. He resolutely exploited this double insight to bring himself temporarily back into Wilson's favor so that he could settle his personal score with Villa. But Villa always knew how to help himself. He was too proud to imitate Carranza's strategy in defeat and to rush into the arms of the Americans in order to endear himself to them - a procedure that Machiavelli's "Principe" would have made his own.

Villa successfully led the remnants of his partisan army from Mexico City back to hideouts in the mountains of northern Mexico, where he bided his time and carefully considered how best to fight both Wilson and Carranza. Incidentally, while Wilson had showered Carranza with war materiel to ensure Villa's defeat, he had not forgotten Carranza's earlier show of independence. Throughout his life, Wilson never forgave anyone he perceived to be defying his own messianic leadership. Instead of allowing Carranza to consolidate his newly regained position by granting him *de jure* recognition, Wilson played cat and mouse with him, granting Carranza on October 19, 1915, was merely a limited and provisional *de facto*

recognition. This strategy naturally made Carranza's regime appear unstable and led many Mexicans to believe that Wilson would drop Carranza a second time - nothing could be simpler, all that was needed was to stop supplying arms to Carranza and divert them to his enemies, of whom, as things stood in Mexico, there were plenty.

. Meanwhile, a section of the American media was clamoring for full-scale U.S. military action inside Mexico to complete the American occupation of the country, bringing about the belated triumph of the movement for the annexation of all of Mexico, which had been led by Senator Lewis Cass of Michigan and which President Polk had forestalled in 1848 by expediting the negotiation of the Guadalupe-Hidalgo Treaty that led to the American seizure of only half of Mexico. The movement for the annexation of all of Mexico - like the movement for the annexation of all of Canada - had never quite died and was immediately warmed up in 1915 by the tabloid journalism of the Pulitzer and Hearst press, which "loudly forced "Jo7 a final and decisive Mexican campaign.

Mexico's state existence is at stake

Wilson and his advisors directed this press campaign, and in the US Senate, two very influential members from the Mexican border, Senators Fall of New Mexico and Hayden of Texas, eagerly tried to convince their colleagues that 500,000 US troops would be enough for most of Mexico^{308^}, that 500,000 US troops would be enough to conquer all of Mexico^{308^} General Hugh Scott, Chief of Staff of the US Army, publicly advocated an extermination campaign against Mexico, and most Catholic Church leaders openly supported Scott, Fall and Hayden because Carranza was a Freemason. The U.S. was only 20 percent Catholic in 1915, but Catholics-apart from Judaism-had the best organized religious pressure group. The question of whether to end Carranza and all of Mexico was hotly debated and was nearing a climax in January 1916 when Villa led a bold coup to thwart the American imperialist plot that threatened Mexico's continued existence.

Viila's men shot sixteen U.S. citizens dead in an attack on a railroad train on January 11, 1916, and among other operations, Villa advanced across the American border and fought another skirmish at Columbus, New Mexico, on March 9, 1916, in which his men killed another nineteen U.S. citizens. Viila's bold tactics threw the anti-Mexican US imperialists, including Wilson, into confusion, as there was an outcry in the US mass media against going after Carranza, Viila's enemy, when in fact it was Villa himself-a very smart Mexican patriot, as it turned out-not Carranza who was massacring Americans.

Angry and disappointed, Wilson bowed to this pressure. On March 15, 1916,

he ordered General Pershing, a less than brilliant career officer, to lead a large American army into northern Mexico to confront Villa and kill him and all his men. Pershing pushed three hundred miles deep into Mexico in thirty days, but his magnificent campaign ended in a laughable fiasco. Not only had Pershing been unable to engage Villa's main force; the wily Mexicans resorted to the old Apache ambush tactic, which enabled them to severely decimate Pershing's men without any losses of their own. Villa had more military skill in his little finger than Pershing had in total.

Now Villa could afford to play the laughing third. The recent massive American invasion had enraged all of Mexico, and Carranza himself had to bow to Mexican public opinion and send regular Mexican troops to confront the advancing Americans. Carranza thought it would be enough to send the troops north, but actual battles could be avoided, but he had not reckoned with the hot-tempered American company leaders. One of these, Captain Boyd, attacked one of Carranza's units in June 1916 and suffered a defeat in the ensuing battle; ten American soldiers were killed and twenty-four taken prisoner³⁹. In the end, Pershing found himself in combat with both Villa and Carranza, but had orders to destroy only Villa, who was circling him³¹⁰.

The European war saves Mexico

This was the moment when Sam Gompers, the Jewish head of the leading American trade union organization, the American Federation of Labor, appeared on the scene. Tsarist Russia, the anti-Jewish supremacy of the world and the main ally of British imperialism, had been largely defeated by German troops in the course of 1915. All of Russia was teetering on the brink of revolution after more than thirty-five years of a terrorist Jewish Kramola campaign inside the country. This combination of a stalled, unbalanced economy, internal Jewish rampaging and crushing defeats on the war front was clearly no match for Tsar Nicholas II - and probably no other leader, however wise and measured, would have been able to cope with it, especially as mighty Britain collaborated with Jewry against its own ally. By rejecting the desperate attempt of the Turks in 1914 to join the Allies instead of the Germans through unfulfillable demands, British diplomacy had created a situation in which Russia was no less closely blocked than Germany. The regimes of England and France, had they been subjected to similar pressures, would by this time have long since collapsed - as David Lloyd George admitted³¹¹. Gompers accordingly believed that the fall of Tsarist Russia was assured, and learned from his B'nai B'rith comrades that the time was fast approaching when the US would be forced to intervene directly in Europe to destroy Germany, the victor

over Tsarist Russia. So Gompers rushed to persuade Carranza, an ardently pro-Jewish Freemason, to appease Wilson and thus forestall the Catholic and other forces in the US that sought to liquidate Carranza's Masonic regime in Mexico.

This strategy proved successful: Carranza raised no more objections to the American operations against Villa, he released all American prisoners unconditionally and offered Wilson huge new oil concessions for the USA in Mexico. Now Wilson's greed was boundless and his demands so impossible to meet that Carranza was forced to reject the specific terms of Wilson's so-called final settlement offer on December 27, 1916, and the official U.S.-Mexican Arbitration Commission had to dissolve on January 15, 1917. Nevertheless, Carranza's protracted new negotiations and his generous concessions to the United States had temporarily taken the wind out of the sails of the gang-led by Scott, Fall, and Hayden and supported by the Catholic Church-that was bent on conquering all of Mexico.

Admittedly: The deadlock of January 1917 could also have meant Carranza's downfall had events not precipitated in Europe, where Wilson had successfully sabotaged the German peace offer of December 12, 1916. As soon as Wilson had been safely re-elected and the German peace offer had been destroyed, Wilson headed wildly for war in Europe. Fortunately for Carranza, Mexican affairs had to take a temporary back seat³¹²^

Carranza managed to push through a new constitution for Mexico (at the Constituent Assembly in Queretaro, whose delegates had been elected on October 22, 1916), and Wilson, who now had the war against Germany that he had so long and so ardently longed for safely in his pocket, carried out the military evacuation in the course of 1917. The fact remains that, in the face of Wilson's depravity, brutality and cruelty, the whole of Mexico escaped the fate of permanent destruction by a hair's breadth.

Wilson and the Entente leaders

Wilson's false, pious talk that he wanted to make the world ready for democracy temporarily fooled some people in the USA and quite a few in Europe. But Lloyd George, Clemenceau and Orlando, the Big Three of Western European politics at the peace conferences in the Paris suburbs (including the first and most important one at Versailles in early 1919), were not fooled by Wilson for a moment either. Their cynical and contemptuous attitude towards Wilson, the hysterical and unscrupulous sage of Princeton who had been rejected at home by his own constituents, is best contained in Clemenceau's remark that Jesus had needed only one commandment, namely: Love thy neighbor; Moses had needed ten commandments, which Jesus later adopted, but

extended them to all mankind instead of limiting them, as Moses did, to the chosen people of the Jews; Woodrow Thomas Wilson, however, was not satisfied with either one or ten commandments, but proclaimed 14 commandments to the world. Moreover, despite his election defeat in the USA in 1918, he valued his prophetic and messianic abilities highly enough to come to Paris and impose his will on Europe and the whole world.

Although the British Secret Service story that the burly old Clemenceau grabbed the nervous, irritable and frail Wilson by the collar and shook him like a rag doll is not authenticated, it - together with Clemenceau's aforementioned remark - best reflects the true attitude of Western European political leaders towards the would-be world savior Woodrow Wilson. His hypocritical piety and crass haughtiness were intolerable to all ordinary mortals who knew him well and did not have to pretend to love him as Bernard Baruch and the other leading American Jews did. A childhood friend of Wilson's from Virginia told reporters that he had turned down a fantastic job offer from Wilson because he knew him far too well.

It was different with Frank Roosevelt. He sincerely adored Wilson and went with him to Paris in 1919. He shared every one of Wilson's bad traits, and over time he let those bad traits take the reins far more than Wilson ever had until the onset of his permanent mental derangement in September 1919. The coincidence of political preferences and the similarity of pathological symptoms in Woody Wilson and Frank Roosevelt, however, also simplify the analysis of the extent of the crimes both committed against their own country and the whole world.

American aggression in the Western Hemisphere under Wilson (summary)

The de jure recognition of the Mexican government under Carranza on March 13, 1917 - after thousands of lives had been senselessly sacrificed - marked the final closing of the Mexico chapter for Wilson, while he concentrated fully on Europe. However, US military aggression in the Western Hemisphere was not limited to Mexico and the Danish colonies in the Caribbean during Wilson's presidency. Wilson also invaded the Hispanic state of Nicaragua, where he established a de facto military protectorate that was maintained by his immediate successors Harding and Coolidge. 'Wilson also invaded the French-speaking Republic of Haiti, populated by people of color, for which his Secretary of State of the Navy, Frank Roosevelt, happily wrote a "made in USA" constitution in 1915 that closely resembled that of West Germany in 1949. FDR's autocratic constitution for Haiti was imposed on the

population with the bayonets of the US Marines. This elite corps was subordinate to the US Department of the Navy and thus under the direct command of Frank Roosevelt.

FDR had the gall to publicly boast about this questionable achievement in his campaign speeches for the 1920 presidential election. He was the Democratic Party's candidate for the vice presidency. Nine months later, FDR, who had always enjoyed excellent health and fitness, fell ill with polio. But of course his immense wealth allowed him the best doctors, so that his permanent disability was limited to his legs. By 1922, he was back in the political arena.

As a result of Wilson's aggression, the "Gotha Almanac" of 1914 was able to include the following countries in a list of formal American "imperialist" protectorates: 1) Cuba, 2) the Dominican Republic, 3) Haiti, 4) Panama and 5) Liberia. As Duroselle noted, "they were in fact just that" ³ To these five de jure protectorates should be added such wholly American colonies as: 6) the Philippines, 7) Hawaii, 8) Wake Island, 9) Guam, 10) Puerto Rico, 11) Nicaragua, 12) Alaska (where in Wilson's time Russian settlers outnumbered Americans, not to mention Indians and Eskimos), 13) the Virgin Islands, 14) American Samoa, 15) territories in China, occupied by American troops and naval squadrons, 16) US territorial claims in Antarctica, and 17) the US claim under Teddy Roosevelt's Monroe Doctrine Corollary to have special military intervention rights throughout South America, which was never revoked by Wilson. From this it becomes clear that the area of imperialist expansion of the USA in Wilson's time was larger than that of Russia and not far behind the size of the earth-spanning British Empire.

Approximately 10 million square kilometers were under direct US rule, an area twenty times the size of France. The total area for which the USA claimed special jurisdiction - not including the American positions in China and the claims in Antarctica - extended over 28.5 million square kilometers. This area is equivalent in size to the entire vast continent of Africa. Given the voraciousness of the US, it is understandable that a perusal of the Canadian press during the Wilson era reveals Canadian fears of being swallowed up by the US (even if US policy towards Canada had become somewhat more conciliatory since President Benjamin Harrison). In particular, the well-considered program of American economic imperialism in Canada was a point of complaint for most Canadians. Individual American politicians continued to advocate the outright incorporation of Canada by the United States until the time of the Second World War.

Duroselle recalls Wilson's inflated idealism in his speech in Mobile, Alabama in 1913 and correctly notes that Wilson carried out more aggression in Latin America than Teddy Roosevelt and Taft combined. Yet it was their Latin American invasions that Wilson had complained most about at the beginning of

his presidency.

Germany's unrestricted submarine warfare

A few days after informing the US Senate that he intended to play the leading role in the peace negotiations after the end of the war in Europe, Wilson received the German note of February 1, 1917 on the resumption of unrestricted V-boat warfare. The British submarines in the Baltic had never interrupted their unrestricted combat operations. On January 9, 1917, the German military leadership triumvirate of Hindenburg-Ludendorff-Hoffmann finally succeeded in forcing this unwanted decision on Reich Chancellor Theobald von Bethmann Rollweg. Wilson's shameless betrayal of his solemn promise to the Kaiser in 1916, in which he promised peace among equals in the event of his re-election, deprived Bethmann and the Kaiser of any reasonable grounds for opposing this step. The V-boat policy, as advocated by the German military leaders, received the overwhelming support of the Reichstag, including the Marxist Social Democrats³¹⁶.

Although all American court historians have always claimed that the German note of February 1, 1917 came like a bolt from the blue, this is complete nonsense. Wilson, Baruch, House and Lansing had all expected this move by Germany from the moment Wilson torpedoed the Kaiser's peace initiative of December 12, 1916. Everyone knew that Germany was literally starving, especially during the terrible turnip winter of 1916. It would have been madness on its part not to use all available means to force the British to abandon their unlawful and barbaric policy. This especially after Wilson had had the utter gall to assure the British that he would support their position and that the US would enter the war on their side - despite the fact that they had started the war in the first place, and despite their myriad war crimes and opposition to just peace negotiations. House had reported to Wilson in June 1914, even before Sarajevo, that it was only a matter of time before England gave the signal to France and Russia to attack Germany³¹⁷. Bethmann-Hollweg's tenacity to maintain peace between Germany and the USA was further demonstrated by the fact that he sent a secret letter with the official note. In it, he assured Wilson that if the latter reconsidered his opinion and advocated a reasonable peace - as promised in 1916 - the Reich would be prepared to call off the new submarine battle immediately³¹⁸.

Duroselle notes that "Wilson's reaction, after some hours of hesitation, was very severe. ³¹⁹ Wilson and his new Anglophile Secretary of State, Robert Lansing, told the Cabinet on February 2 that they now had sufficient reason to break off diplomatic relations with Germany. Wilson was furious when

Postmaster General Albert Burleson of Texas and Secretary of Labor William Wilson (no relation to Woody) disagreed. (The former was in charge of Democratic political appointments outside the narrowly defined civil service system). They accused Wilson of injustice in his behavior towards Germany after his own betrayal of the Sussex Promise. Wilson took comfort after the brief cabinet meeting in the fact that only two of the members had dared to express their doubts openly. On February 3, 1917, he informed Congress that he had broken off relations with Germany. Furthermore, a declaration of war against the German Reich was to be expected in response to a submarine incident that was expected in the future[^]

The USA declares war on the German Reich

On February 24, England tried to move the matter forward by sending Wilson the text of the so-called Zimmermann Telegram. Contrary to a book by Barbara Tuchmann, the daughter of Henry Morgenthau Jr. in which she completely twists this issue verbatim, this was not a matter of importance at the time. The British had intercepted a code message from the German Undersecretary of State Zimmermann to the German envoy Eckhardt. It indicated that if the United States attacked Germany, Eckhardt was authorized to offer Mexico a territorial adjustment in the event that Carranza was willing to ally with Germany against the Americans. British diplomats admitted after the war that Zimmermann's instructions were nothing out of the ordinary under the circumstances according to diplomatic conventions; but they counted on a hysterical reaction in the US, as had happened 19 years earlier when an innocuous letter from the Spanish envoy had been intercepted. And Wilson used the British material as a cheap excuse to equip American merchant ships with weapons without the consent of Congress^{32^}

Wilson was fascinated by the triumph of subversion in Russia and the overthrow of the old Tsardom in March 1917. He sent Elihu Root on a special mission to Russia to initiate military cooperation between the US and the Russian Provisional Government. Wilson correctly recognized that the American Ambassador Francis from Chicago was too conservative to participate in the dirty game Wilson was promoting to ensure the ultimate victory of Bolshevism over the prostrate Russians^{322^} Wilson perversely insisted that as a result of the Russian Revolution "the conscience of the Americans could now be clear "^{323^}

Only a small number of Americans died during the entire war due to German V-boat attacks on American ships. This was different in the "Lusitania" incident, where foolish Americans had gone on a wartime voyage on a British auxiliary cruiser loaded with weapons. Only three Americans had died as a result of German unrestricted submarine warfare until Wilson announced on

March 20, 1917, that a special session of the U.S. Congress was to be held on April 2, 1917, to declare war on Germany³²⁴^ When Congress convened, Wilson delivered a grossly distorted and hysterical message in which he slobbered that Germany was at war "against humanity...against all nations." ³²⁵

Despite the normal excitement that always prevails when nations enter major wars, no other modern nation (until Prime Minister Chamberlain's speech at Birmingham on March 17, 1939) had heard such corrupt and rotten arguments in an artificially organized campaign of hypocritical rhetoric designed to drive it into war. The American Congress had been hopelessly corrupt for generations, so that only 50 members of the House of Representatives and 6 Senators dared to vote against Wilson's call for war. The few who voted against Wilson's imperious request were then shamelessly persecuted. In some cases their homes were vandalized, in others their children were beaten, and they were all insulted as traitors and ruthlessly slandered as spies of the emperor. Duroselle, the educated Frenchman, could only mock Wilson's crude mythology: "The rulers of Germany were therefore to blame for everything ... even the Austro-Hungarian attack on Serbia." ³²⁶

A Senate Committee
investigates Wilson's machinations 20 years later

Wilson, the arch war criminal, continued to inundate the US with hysterical phrases and blather throughout the war. His favorite slogan would have stuck in the throat of any decent person under similar circumstances: "Right is more valuable than peace." ³²⁷ Had Wilson been an honest man-which he never was-he would have admitted that neither law nor peace had had any value in the long and bloody annals of American imperialism, nor in the exploitation of the oppressed masses at home. Literally thousands of American strikers were killed by Pinkerton detectives, National Guard troops and other agents of American plutocratic miscreants during the decades of Wilson's life³²⁸^ Moreover, this tidal wave of domestic murder actually reached a climax during Wilson's presidency.

The whole mess was finally cleared up by an investigation by the US Senate in 1934, chaired by Senator Russen Nye and published in the Congressional Record³²⁹. Wilson, the tool of Bernard Baruch, received his orders from the Rothschilds and the other so-called international bankers. His political career had been launched by J. P. Morgan together with Colonel Harvey as his henchman. Wilson only responded to the demands of the rich and never cared about the wishes of the American people. When the war was triggered by England in 1914, Wilson invested as much American capital as he could in

England and France. But while he was supposedly neutral, hundreds of thousands of German soldiers were killed and maimed by American weapons, something he never gave a moment's thought either. No sooner was American Jewry able to inform Wilson that England, despite having conceded Palestine to a Greater Arabia in 1915 and to France in 1916, was prepared to accept the demands of world Zionist Jewry for Arab-inhabited Palestine, than Wilson had no more reason to hesitate: he thrust the USA into the war in favor of world Zionism, Jewish Bolshevism and British imperialism. This happened at a time when Germany, despite its brilliant victories, was almost bled dry by the huge coalition against the Reich organized by envious Albion.

Throughout his presidency, Wilson was dishonorable and a continuing disgrace. While the overwhelming majority of the American people were opposed to going to war both in 1914-1917 and later from 1939-1941, things were quite different for the small international clique of plutocratic evildoers. Wilson's war policy plundered the natural resources of the American people and at the same time created 15,000 new American millionaires.

If one remembers that in 1934-1935, when the Nye Report was written, there was a widespread belief that the unprecedented economic depression in the US, which had begun ten years after Wilson's mental derangement, was a consequence of the unnecessary war and the subsequent bad peace, it is not surprising that a full 80 percent of Americans in a 1937 poll thought that Wilson's war policy had been a hair-raising mistake.

The Jewish media, the myriad of Jewish lobbies and the Jewish-controlled Office of War Information during World War II had to spend billions of dollars to make us forget this true picture of Wilson and his impact on the US and the world, and to whitewash the even more inhumane and horrific crimes of his disciple Frank Roosevelt. Yet even though this propaganda has continued for many decades since FDR's 1937 Chicago Bridge speech, there is still no chance that a majority of Americans in a fair referendum would declare Wilson's and FD R's crimes justified. The unstoppable double-digit inflation in the US, the loss of America's international prestige after the military defeats in Korea and Vietnam, the terrible permanent problems created for the world by Bolshevism and Zionism have made it impossible for the Jewish media in the US to constantly brainwash the entire US population.

The American people did not want war

Duroselle's own critical research on Wilson and Roosevelt could not possibly keep pace with the mass of venal American court historians and journalists who spent decade after decade trying to refute the obvious basic

facts. But by consulting a book by Walter Lippmann³³⁰ on the question of whether Wilson was acting on behalf of the American people when he pursued his unnecessary and unwanted war against Germany, Duroselle unfortunately chose the most influential apologist for Wilson and FDR. Lippmann was a wealthy Jew with endless connections. His regularly published newspaper columns appeared across the country for decades and always carried the same message. Lippmann lied when he claimed that Wilson had to bow to popular pressure for war. Likewise, Lord Halifax had lied in claiming that Neville Chamberlain had to give in to the British people's push for war at the time of his Birmingham speech on March 17, 1939. Winston Churchill, Britain's chief warmonger in 1939, admitted that he was completely surprised to hear that Chamberlain had advocated war at Birmingham rather than peace.

The claim in Lippmann's book that the British navy had protected the USA from an enemy invasion since Waterloo in 1815 sounds particularly grotesque. The only threats of foreign invasion during this period came from the British, who in 1814 had burned Washington/D. C. in 1814 and who could easily have defeated the USA at sea at the time of the Anglo-American Venezuela crisis in 1895, had it not been for a major setback for the British in South Africa, the failure of the Jameson expedition to destroy Transvaal.

It is a simple fact that for decades the American court historians, which include the majority of all professional historians due to the constraints of academic life in the USA, together with Jewish journalists like Lippmann, told the American people mainly lies about Wilson's and FDR's foreign policy. But the popular resentment against these two arch-war criminals did not cease; on the contrary, after the onset of unstoppable inflation and the American defeat in Vietnam, it became louder than ever. Lest one judge individual American court historians too harshly, it should be remembered that most of them are not as wealthy as the late Walter Lippmann. Moreover, in the United States, where the pressure for total conformity has always been stronger than in most other countries, it has long been virtually impossible for an independent historian to hold any position in an American college or university, public or private. The hysteria artificially created by the insane propaganda campaign of lies on the part of the Wilson regime after the U.S. entry into the war was finally achieved on April 6, 1917 - a mass hysteria. The hysteria artificially created by the insane propaganda lie campaign on the part of the Wilson regime after the USA's entry into the war was finally achieved on April 6, 1917 - a mass confusion that peaked in 1918 and almost completely disappeared in 1919, followed in the same year by a new wave of hysteria that was directed exclusively at the so-called red danger - this American hysteria of 1918 cannot erase the simple truth and accuracy of Duroselle's judgment: "In 1917 there was nothing comparable to the national outbreak of 1898." ³³¹

Wilson always had an extremely strange idea of the office of President of the USA. He believed that the president should distance himself from public opinion, stand above it, and then shape it and adapt it to his own will³³². Frank Roosevelt took up this Wilsonian idea during his own career in Wilson's wake and applied it to his own program after 1933. It was the same as Jean Bodin's thoughts on the absolutist political philosophy of the French monarchy after Louis XI had won his decisive battles with the French nobility, or the realization of this philosophy in the early reign of Louis XIV. It was a special Wilson-Roosevelt doctrine that contradicted everything that had ever been written about the office of the American president, be it by George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams or James Madison. For they all believed that the US president was a representative elected by the people like any other member of Congress. They also believed that it was his duty to follow the dictates of the people at all times and, as their devoted representative, to bow to the sublime wisdom of the will of the people.

Even Abraham Lincoln, who played the dictator of the Union during the American Civil War, took the view that if he anticipated popular opinion with an initiative, he would only do so under the duress of a momentary emergency. Woody Wilson and Frank Roosevelt, on the other hand, insisted on principle that the elected president should be removed from the control of the people and public opinion. Yet no amount of scrutiny of their collected writings reveals a foreign source for this presumption of right. Teddy Roosevelt had believed that there were short-term occasions when a president could rightly take the initiative and act independently. But like Wilson and FDR, he never dared to elevate such occasional whims to a permanent state.

This Wilson-Roosevelt theory of divine right hardly disturbed the plutocratic evildoers, because neither Woody Wilson nor Frank Roosevelt ever offered them any real resistance, apart from a few demagogic gestures intended to appease the oppressed masses. Wilson and FDR would, of course, have been disposed of as quickly as possible had their theory of divine right defied the evildoers, whose puppets they always remained.

The military achievements of the Americans in Europe

The direct military role of the USA during the First World War was insignificant. Wilson was able to send 2079,000 poorly trained soldiers to France until the armistice on November 11, 1918. More than half of them were transported on British ships. Foch's victory in the 2nd Battle of the Marne in July 1918, some 15 months after the USA officially entered the war, interrupted the uniform course of German victories on the Western Front since the USA entered the war. However, this was exclusively a French victory. The American

military aircraft were so miserable that the American pilots had to fly English and French planes. The German Luftwaffe was still able to hold its own against the combined Allied air forces at the time of the armistice.

Despite the help that the British and French were able to offer them, the American units on the front were badly shattered by the end of the battle. The end ultimately came not through a breakthrough of the German front, which remained intact throughout the war in the West and elsewhere, but rather through revolutionary Marxist upheavals within Germany. These had been developing since the first year of the war and had grown into a veritable flood after the triumph of Bolshevism in Russia in November 1917.

But just as the US had claimed defeat at the hands of the British in the War of 1812-1815 as a victory, they now insisted that the Allies' triumph in 1918 was due solely to America's fighting prowess and not to American military supplies, which had been indispensable to France and Britain since 1915. One has to bear in mind these usual Yankee boastings, as well as the unimaginably bad behavior of US troops in France, in order to understand the popular hostility of the French and English towards America during the 1920s. The official resentment of the Americans at the refusal of the English and French to pay debts incurred by Americans was only one aspect. Although their role in the fighting itself had been minimal, the Americans considered their troops to be the best in the world. This euphoria lasted until the US military defeats in Korea and Vietnam³³³^

The Fourteen Points as a propaganda tool

Wilson's most despicable foray into international propaganda was his use of the Fourteen Points, written for him by his personal political ally Leon Bronstein Trotsky, who along with Lenin and Stalin was one of the three chieftains of Jewish Bolshevism. Like Trotsky and Lenin, Stalin did not have Jewish blood in his veins, but he was married to his third wife, a Jewish woman, for the longest time. Her brother Lazar Kaganovich led more of Stalin's murder campaigns than any other Soviet functionary. Kaganovich's terror operations included the First Five-Year Plan, whereby southern Russia was cleansed of non-Russian ethnic groups and eight million people were killed. This included the great political chistka (purge) of 1936- 1939, which claimed another eight million victims, including an enormous number of Jewish dissidents, leading New York Times correspondent W. Duranty to state that Stalin, Churchill and FDR's most beloved ally, had killed more Jews than Hitler ever imprisoned³³⁴^

Wilson's sole intention when he first proclaimed Trotsky's Fourteen Points as his own work before the American Congress on January 9, 1918, was to drive a wedge between Germany and the Soviet Jewish-Bolshevik peace negotiators at Brest-Litovsk. He also wanted to provide new propaganda ammunition for the

Bolshevik faction led by the two fanatical Jews Trotsky and Joffe - the latter formally acting as the leader of the Soviet peace delegation. This was intended to demoralize the German troops and prevent their further advance - at the very moment when the Bolsheviks, in a typically revolutionary wartime ruse, broke off the peace negotiations and had to reckon with the Germans resuming their advance. Although Lenin, the supreme Soviet vozhd (leader), co-led with Stalin the group that did not believe in the success of this strategy, he agreed to give Trotsky and his followers an opportunity to try out their plan. Lenin simply declared that if the plan failed, the Bolsheviks would have to return to the old negotiating table at Brest-Litovsk.

Wilson proclaimed the points written by Trotsky and delivered by Wilson's agent in the USSR, Dillon, as his own work. This was done in time for the interruption of the

The Bolsheviks were able to distribute millions of propaganda leaflets about the so-called Wilson Points to the German troops on the Eastern Front during the armistice, which had been in force since December 1917 as a prelude to the expected separate peace between Germany and Soviet Russia. In the end, however, Lenin and Stalin were right, and Trotsky, Joffe and Wilson were wrong.

The German-Soviet peace treaty

The Red Army was still weak. Only three months had passed since the successful Soviet coup, which had taken place with the help of Wilson, Lloyd George and world Jewry. Wilson had allowed thousands of American Jews to rush to Russia in 1917, during the regime of Prince Lvov and Kerensky, to act as agitators for Bolshevism-and this despite the restrictions on wartime travel imposed on ordinary American citizens, and despite the protests of the American Ambassador Francis, Wilson's own envoy. The British Foreign Office, nominally presided over by Lloyd George in 1917 as dictator of the war coalition, had been seeking to destroy the Tsarist Empire since Pitt's speech against Russia in the English House of Commons in 1791³³⁵ World Jewry had been assisting Britain in its clandestine struggle against Tsarist Russia since the failure of the Jewish Paris Commune in 1871^{JJ6}.

Although Bolshevik propaganda during the Soviet-German armistice between December 1917 and February 1918 was to have great effect among German soldiers-many German soldiers were Marxist Social Democrats, mainly because the Marxist SPD had become Germany's largest party and had provided the largest number of Reichstag deputies since 1912-the German army

was nevertheless able to resume its victorious advance into Russia. Lenin's coup had destroyed the old Russian army and there was little resistance to a rapid German advance.

Lenin sent his negotiators back to Brest-Litovsk in apparently high spirits - based on his confidence in a future revolutionary triumph throughout Europe. In the meantime, however, a Green Ukraine of Ukrainian nationalists from among the people, who professed allegiance to neither Red nor White Russia, had declared its independence and formed a provisional government in Kiev under Hetman Skoropadski. Thus the Bolsheviks had to atone for their delaying tactics and their refusal to recognize a new independent nation of forty million on the soil of the old tsarist empire, which they had wanted to take over intact.

During the initial negotiations with the Germans at Brest-Litovsk, Joffe, Trotsky and Lenin had demanded the entire eighty percent of Poland that had belonged to Tsarist Russia at the outbreak of war in 1914. It was common knowledge that Germany had no territorial annexations of any kind in mind-the Reichstag peace resolution of 1917 had become official German policy-and also that Germany was practising what Wilson only pretended to support, namely to conclude a peace based on the self-determination of the European peoples. General Max Hoffmann, the chairman of the German negotiators, asked whether the Bolsheviks really expected the anti-Russian and anti-communist Poles to vote for their red rule in a referendum. The typical Bolshevik answer to this was a harbinger of the inevitable horrors of an Allied victory in 1945 in the Second World War: Hoffmann was told that the Poles would gladly vote for Bolshevism if the plebiscite was preceded by a sufficiently long occupation of Poland by the Red Army and political purges.

Baruch and Wilson naturally hoped that Bolshevism would spread throughout Poland, because they had something against the fact that in 1918 Poland was the most anti-Jewish nation in Europe. The Poles had to pay heavily for this at the peace conference in Versailles in 1919: Wilson and his Jews burdened them there with numerous restrictions and servitudes in favor of Jewry. All this was laid down in the book-length Treaty of Versailles. It was only too understandable that, after Wilson went mad and the USA rejected the treaty, the Poles laughed at Lloyd George when he tried to invoke the anti-Polish and pro-Jewish provisions of the treaty³³⁷.

Secret war aims of the Allies

In 1917, after Wilson's blatant betrayal of Kaiser Wilhelm's initiative for a fair peace, Germany became the only belligerent nation officially committed to seeking a European peace without annexations, based on self-determination. Germany's sincerity in deed and word was fully confirmed by the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in March 1918. This provided for strict self-determination for the

Russian peripheral territories occupied by the Germans and did not allow even one square centimeter of land to be added to Imperial Germany, a state roughly the size of France but with 40 percent more inhabitants. Moreover, from December 1917, under the reliable guidance of the professional Russian historian Mikhail Pokrovsky - who added extensive facsimile material of important documents to his published revelations - the Bolsheviks set about opening the archives of the Tsarist Empire, especially those of the Tsarist Foreign Ministry in St. Petersburg-Petrograd-Leningrad. All the solemn secret treaties concluded by the Allies between 1914 and 1917 came to light.

These treaties were a revelation. Apart from the 2.6 million square kilometers of conquered territories that were to go to the greedy British Empire, huge territorial gains were planned for Japan, France and Italy. Serbia was to receive a large part of Austria; the once neutral Greece, which had in the meantime been conquered by England (without protest from the USA), was to receive Bulgarian and Turkish territories. A piece of purely German territory (Eupen-Malmedy) was to go to Belgium, and much more besides. Wilson's pathological hatred of Germany reached its feverish peak of hysterical cruelty in 1918, when Klio, the righteous goddess of history, uninfluenced by the censorship and surveillance of Wilson's dictatorship of terror in the USA, confirmed Germany as the angel and England as the devil in this war.

The mob was officially encouraged to destroy the printing presses, businesses, farms and homes of millions of loyal and decent German-Americans. To this day, they remain terrified because of Wilson's brutal terror against them in 1917-1918. One of my aunts was employed by the Red Cross in Oregon and became engaged to a German-American named Voss in 1918. She was immediately sent letters calling her a "barbarian sweetheart" and told that she would be burned alive as a German whore. As horrific as the crimes committed against tens of thousands of US citizens of Japanese descent during the Second World War, who were locked up in concentration camps for purely chauvinistic-racist reasons, the treatment of German-Americans in the USA during the First World War was even more cruel by far.

Germany and the Fourteen Points

Under these circumstances, it is no small irony that the German political leaders, of all people, were the only ones in the world to believe in the honest intentions of Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points. This German belief was irrefutably confirmed on February 24, 1918 in the Reichstag speech of Bethmann Rollweg's successor, Chancellor Count Hertling (1843-1919), a conscientious Christian German philosopher and former professor of

philosophy at the University of Munich. Hertling's words were received with applause by the Reichstag when he declared that Wilson's official Fourteen Points of January 9, 1918 - as interpreted by Herding - contained nothing unacceptable for Germany, especially since Wilson had solemnly promised that any territorial settlement of the future peace agreement would be based on genuine and objective national self-determination. Wilson's 13th point, for example, demanded that Poland, whose former independence had been restored by Germany's efforts and confirmed by German diplomatic *de jure* recognition in 1916, should have access to the Baltic Sea - a perfectly reasonable demand. However, when the Allies took the Adriatic coast from Hungary the following year, they offered no such sea access in compensation. Hertling was an educated scholar - unlike Wilson, who had never seen continental Europe and whose ignorance of the area was proverbial - and was well informed about the demographic facts of the Europe of his time. He would never have dreamed that the following year the Allies would establish a crazy corridor for Poland to the Baltic Sea through an area that had had a German majority population for the past 700 years and had also been part of the ancient Germanic land almost 2000 years ago, in the time of Tacitus, many hundreds of years before the Danish Vikings created the modern Polish state.

For a century before the First World War, there had certainly been a strong migration of Poles to West Prussia, the province that was separated by the Allies for the Polish corridor. This migration took place due to oppressive economic and political conditions in Russian Poland and also due to the traditional Prussian hospitality towards the Poles. Prussia had tried to save Polish independence through a Prussian-Polish alliance in 1790, but its valiant attempt was thwarted by English diplomacy. Nevertheless, the percentage of the Polish population in the last census before the First World War in West Prussia (1910) was only 23 percent - although such censuses in Prussia always counted heavily in favor of the Poles, as the salaries of Prussian officials increased in proportion to the number of Poles in their districts. Certainly this 23 percent was no reason to transfer a German territory to Poland - and this on the basis of a system of self-determination that had been proclaimed by Wilson and later accepted by the Allies. On February 24, 1918, Hertling made the generous offer to create opportunities for Polish free ports in such traditional German port cities as Stettin, Danzig and Königsberg. None of these facilities were ever granted to the Hungarians, who suddenly found themselves excluded from access to the sea after 1918.

As far as Alsace-Lorraine was concerned, Hertling recalled that the British Prime Minister Gladstone had suggested a plebiscite in this area in 1871, which was a well-intentioned wish on the British side, but which Bismarck did not even want to think about, because the traditionally German territory that was

returned to the Germans by France in 1871, comprising the whole of Alsace and a third of Lorraine, had an ethnic German majority of 90 percent. During their own rule in the area, the French had never even remotely considered allowing a plebiscite. Although it was originally administered by Berlin as an "Reichsland" after its re-annexation, by the First World War Alsace-Lorraine had become an independent southern German state with its own legislative parliament. Its war volunteers and conscripts had - with a few insignificant exceptions - fought bravely under the terrible hail of Allied shells of American origin since 1914. Herding therefore had every reason to believe that any genuine plebiscite in Alsace-Lorraine, which was to be determined in a negotiated peace, would go in Germany's favor.

Wilson had in no way demanded the unconditional return of the territory to France, he had merely mentioned a "historical injustice" that needed to be put right. In the context of his support for self-determination everywhere, this could only mean a plebiscite along Gladstone's lines. These two examples characterize Hertling's way of thinking when - after going through each point individually and discussing with particular pleasure Wilson's 2nd point, which dealt with the freedom of the seas, an old German demand - he announced to the delighted Reichstag that he could accept Wilson's Fourteen Points unconditionally and without amendment. He was referring to their interpretation as he had presented them to the Reichstag, i.e. according to honest, fair and objective principles. The translated text of Hertling's speech was immediately sent to Wilson, who made no objections, not even to the comments on the individual points.

The Soviets, of course, realized that the Fourteen Points were a fraud, as Trotsky had drafted them for Wilson's dirty propaganda against Germany and Eastern Europe. Both Wilson and the Soviet leaders hoped that the Bolshevik tide would spread to Poland, Germany and other European states. The British, French, Italians and Japanese also knew that the Fourteen Points were a fraud because they had received assurances from US Secretary of State Lansing that Wilson would definitely remember the spoils of war he had promised them in secret treaties (published by the Soviets) in any future settlement.

If one remembers that in February 1918, Germany was to expect the release of its troops on the eastern front, which would lead to military parity with the Allies in the west for the first time since October 1914 (then, in 1914, the Germans went on the defensive after failing to take Paris and sending additional German units east against Russia), and that it would have become possible for Germany to maintain this parity in 1918 and 1919, notwithstanding the arrival of American troops in France; if one also remembers that Ludendorff - a military genius, far superior to English, French or American commanders - had devised some brilliant tactics for the future German offensives that were to

begin on March 21. March, had developed some brilliant tactics for both the war of position and the war of movement; if one also keeps in mind that at that time, despite a brief munitions workers' strike in Germany in January 1918, no one could tell how far the Marxist, mainly Jewish, subversive plundering work within the Reich had progressed; that, in short, Germany was in no way at a military disadvantage in February 1918 - so one comes to the conclusion that Hertling - not to mention his reputation in academic, political and private terms - had no reason to tell the untruth about his true attitude towards the Fourteen Points. And the same applies to Kaiser Wilhelm, who agreed with Hertling. It is also clear from this that the voluntary acceptance of the Fourteen Points by official Germany became a historical fact long before the fortunes of battle turned against Germany in July 1918.

Incidentally, this military turnaround did not turn into a major defeat for Germany, as the German front was never broken through. Without the coup d'état at its back, this stab in the back, Germany could easily have prevented the Allies on the Western Front from penetrating deeper into German territory during 1919. The peace that Hertling wanted to conclude in February 1918 was essentially the same as it; In Kaiser Wilhelm and Bethmann Rollweg had offered in December 1916, and there is no reasonable reason to believe that Germany would not have interrupted its offensive preparations and gone to the negotiating table instead, had Wilson (apart from not objecting) even responded in any positive way to Hertling's speech. This speech had, after all, been approved by the same Reichstag which in July 1917 had voted overwhelmingly against any German territorial gains from that terrible war, and which favored a just peace among equal sovereign nations, even imploring Heaven to end at last the carnage imposed on Germany by England through her aggressive machinations in 1914, as during the dozen years of bitter British hostility which preceded the outbreak of the dreadful war.

The problem was that Wilson himself had not believed a word of what he proclaimed in his speech to the US Congress on January 9, 1918. The speech was intended only as a dirty war-mongering ploy, and Wilson had for years allowed himself to be harnessed to the aims of British imperialism, Bolshevism and Zionism, none of which had anything to do with a reasonable peace among equal peoples as propagated in Wilson's speech to Congress. A world champion liar like Wilson was so used to deceiving his wives, lovers, acquaintances, subordinates and fellow citizens in his own country for years that he experienced a euphoric ecstasy when he successfully deceived Germany in 1916 and 1918.

Wilson's goal: the overthrow of the German Reich

Wilson was eager to commit his greatest fraud ever. The opportunity presented itself to him before the end of 1918: he wanted chaotic conditions in Germany so that Jewish Bolshevism could take over the country. He was determined that when the Germans' situation became desperate due to military defeats at the front and subversion at home, he would pretend that Germany could only receive these golden fourteen points if the legitimate government had been overthrown and replaced by a revolutionary regime. The confusion would then be perfect if Wilson refused to make the slightest concession to the revolutionary regime, once he had got it to sign a hasty armistice on the hypocritical basis of the Fourteen Points, which were considered sacrosanct only by the German leaders, but not by those of the United States, Japan, England, France and Italy.

Wilson's opportunity came in October 1918, when Ludendorff had been dismissed and Germany, with the help of Swiss diplomatic intermediaries, openly pursued negotiations for peace on the basis Wilson had promised in his Fourteen Points. Wilson seized the opportunity in October 1918 with an endless series of infamous public exhortations to the German people to rise up against their legitimate government and overthrow it by force: this was the only way to get peace terms that would guarantee Germany's survival. Wilson's diabolical policy of 1918 far surpassed the sordid imperialist machinations that his English masters had been practicing for the previous four centuries. Indeed, even the deceitful British were unable to match Wilson in breathtaking wrongheadedness; it was not until Frank Roosevelt's criminally aggressive foreign policy began in October 1937 that the Americans committed a series of war crimes and crimes against humanity during the seven and a half years leading up to April 1945 that dwarfed even Wilson.

Duroselle expresses this very aptly by suggesting that Wilson's goal with the Fourteen Points was only that of subversive revolution and not peace³³⁸. The failure to recognize this difference before the infamous terms of the Treaty of Versailles were actually in place in 1919 cost Germany dearly overall and destroyed any longer-term chance of a German revolutionary government - apart from Bolshevism on the left and National Socialism on the right. The NSDAP, founded in 1919 in response to the betrayal of Germany, became the only German right-wing ideology after 1918 that could ever hope to win more than 15 percent of the vote in any general German election.

What the Germans "owe" to Wilson

During the period of the Weimar Republic, which lasted less than 14 years (from April 1919 to January 1933), there were numerous elections and twenty-

one coalition governments in Berlin before Hitler arrived. But one thing always remained the same: the Marxist German parties never achieved less than 40 percent of the total vote in any of these elections, and all the other German parties, with the exception of the NSDAP and the DNVP (Deutschnationale Volkspartei), constantly made overtures to the Marxists and accepted their terms. The DNVP, the second right-wing party alongside the NSDAP, was unable to achieve more than 8 percent of the vote in the four general elections in Germany in 1932 (two of which were Reichstag elections and two presidential elections). So with or without the "made in USA" economic crisis of 1929, Germany only had the choice between Hitler and Marxism after Wilson's fraud of 1918. After the German treasonous elite finished off Hitler in 1945 with the help of FD R, Churchill and Stalin, in the absence of a German leader of Hitler's stature, only Marxism remained.

The Communist Party was the first to be allowed to organize in Berlin's western sectors in 1945, and although a clearly Marxist leadership for the whole of West Germany did not exist until 1969 under Willy Brandt - some twenty years after the American post-war puppet Federal Republic had been organized - the opposition of the CDU-CSU, which was conservative in name but left-wing in essence, to Marxism was so weak and its concessions so great that it would have been more correct to mark the beginning of the Marxist regime in West Germany in 1919. The opposition to Marxism of the CDU-CSU, which is conservative in name but left-wing in essence, was so weak and its concessions to the Marxist world view so great that it would be more correct to place the beginning of the Marxist regime in West Germany in 1949 and in Germany as a whole in 1945.

After all, it was Jewry that had triumphed over Germany more than any other single force-and even the supposedly right-wing authoritarian Israeli parliament, the Knesset, today has a majority of Marxist and Marxist-minded MPs. This is not surprising, since Karl Marx is a popular demigod for the overwhelming majority of world Jewry - in Jewish Zionism as well as in Jewish Bolshevism - and since most Germans after 1945 were anxious, both at home and abroad, not to upset world Jewry. The Jewish mass extermination campaign of 1945 against Germany was initiated in the West by the Morgenthau Plan, in the East by Stalin's Jewish Bolshevism (rape and murder of millions, extermination and depopulation of huge parts of old German territory).

It is not surprising that the most influential West German publisher, Axel Springer, has repeatedly insisted in public that the West German media should design their publications and broadcasts to be acceptable to the Israelis - a people literally seething with hatred of everything German. So in the end, the

post-war governments in Bonn, Berlin and Vienna are all Marxist-oriented.

Hitler thus first interrupted and then delayed the final annihilation of Germany (and only the perpetual German treasonous elite prevented him from delaying it forever), the annihilation that the pathological Wilson had aimed at in 1918 and which became Frank Roosevelt's ultimate goal in 1937, when it became apparent that Hitler had consolidated his position and that under his leadership Germany could forever escape the final annihilation of the Reich that Wilson had so eagerly pursued. This, and nothing else, is what American-German relations really looked like in the 20th century. It must be strongly emphasized that the Kaiserreich would not have been overthrown in 1918 without Wilson's support for German-Jewish Marxism, and that Hitler could not have been overthrown in 1945 by the small German treasonous clique, if FDR had not brought Churchill to power in 1940 and artificially kept England's lost war against Germany going, if FDR had not given enormous aid to the Soviet Union in 1941-1945, and if Roosevelt - to use the admirable expression of Clare Booth Luce, former US ambassador to Rome - had lied the American people into World War II.

Should there ever again be a free Germany in the history of mankind - not necessarily one like the Kaiser's or Hitler's time, but no less free for that - one hesitates to estimate the amount of compensation such a free Germany could in good conscience demand from the United States - a state currently in the last throes of economic and financial bankruptcy. For the same reason, the shameful mistreatment of Germany by the United States in the 20th century, which surpasses anything that major nations have done to each other in the course of history, will forever remain an evil and dark stain in the annals of humanity. These facts must be borne in mind by the whole world if it is to recover from the Wilson-Roosevelt disease.

Wilson's presidency - a disaster for the internal development of the USA

Wilson called the Jewish-inspired garbage that made up his so-called foreign policy "the new diplomacy" ³³⁹ This House-Baruchian foreign policy, like Brandeis's so-called New Freedom domestic policy, was intended, through the repeated use of the word "new", to create the illusion among the oppressed American masses that progressivism, the truly new thing that Fighting Bob LaFollette had introduced into American life as a whole from 1900 onwards, was somehow still alive during Wilson's presidency. The harsh repression and Wilson's completely reactionary policies from 1917 onwards had completely dispelled this illusion by 1919. The entire American people realized that they

had been fooled and deceived by the sick Princeton professor, and that the slogan of the "war to end the war" had been nothing but pretentious drivel. Progressivism could not be revived after the death blow dealt by Wilson in 1917, when he thrust the US into a larger war fought exclusively for reactionary, doomed British imperialism and its allies, world Jewry in its twin manifestations of Bolshevism and Zionism.

To be sure, Fighting Bob LaFollette had never backed down from the Wilson reaction, nor from the Harding and Coolidge regimes that followed. His 1924 presidential campaign for the progressive cause - in which he received more than 5 million votes - was a valiant attempt to revive possibilities from the past and pick up the pieces from the dark abyss in which Teddy Roosevelt and Woody Wilson had left the USA twelve years earlier. But it was too little, too late: the unique opportunity that LaFollette's leadership had offered the US in the first dozen years of the 20th century was lost forever. The malevolent, nightmarish forces of international plutocracy had usurped what had once been the promise of American life and had instead become a corrupt and pathetic American destiny reminiscent of the decadal last generations of the defunct Roman Empire.

Just as the thwarting of both Gracchi attempts at reform toward the end of the Roman Republic had put an end forever to genuine Roman political and socioeconomic reform, so the failure of LaFollette's 1912 bid for U.S. leadership marked the final end of any chance that such popular movements could succeed in the post-1865 United States, such as Populism (which arguably focused on only two issues, agrarian and monetary reform) and the magnificent Progressivism of LaFollette, who had talented and imaginative disciples across the country and, on top of that, a superbly cohesive and balanced program that tackled all the major issues.

These main issues were: 1) constitutional reform, 2) electoral reform, 3) political party reform, 4) tariff reform, 5) local government reform, 6) education reform, 7) reform in favor of social justice, 8) elimination of the unclean lobbies and pressure groups that had always plagued American life, 9) tax reform to eliminate the objectionable phenomenon of billionaires in a country where millions were starving, 10) agricultural reform with public subsidies for the export of agricultural surpluses (but not the criminal practices of the later Frank Roosevelt program, (but not the practices of the later Frank Roosevelt program of artificially lowering production yields in a country where millions were starving and in a world where hundreds of millions were starving), 11) overall reform of the inadequate quality requirements in the manufacturing and food industries (La Follette's Pure Food and Drug Administration was supposed to be a step in this direction, but it became and remained corrupt after 1912), 12) sweeping reform of the outdated 16th century American legal system, which the

British had created and which was now being used by the U.S. government. (12) the sweeping reform of the antiquated sixteenth-century American legal system, which was a strange mix of English common law, statutory law, and equity, and (13) the creation of a national health insurance system and a coercive reform of the corrupt, plutocratic, and criminal-ridden American medical profession.

Wilson causes worldwide disaster

If LaFollette had become president in 1913 instead of Wilson, the First World War would either not have taken place at all or would only have lasted a very short time. Instead of unfair, one-sided aid from the USA to the Allies and unnecessary military intervention in Europe, the USA would have stood up for the fair and just peace that was so hated by British imperialism and world Jewry.

By 1920 at the latest, the USA would have been rebuilt from top to bottom. Russia could not have been conquered and destroyed by Jewish Bolshevism. A progressive America in the Western Hemisphere and an enlightened Hohenzollern Germany in the Eastern Hemisphere would have worked hand in hand to improve the economy and standard of living worldwide. None of these assumptions are misleading, because they are based - in contrast to the wishful thinking of American court historians - on established facts.

There are several such fateful turning points in world history. Wilson or LaFollette as leader from 1912 onwards, that meant a worsening or an improvement for the whole world. Let the moral relativists continue with their anti-Christian argument that everything in the world consists of different shades of gray in moral terms - this in contrast to Augustine's concept of a black and white contrast in the struggle between good and evil in the world. It is a scientifically demonstrable fact that the difference of Wilson and LaFollette in 1912-1919 was equivalent to the difference of black and white - and Fighting Bob was aware of this when he said in his first speech after the war at the University of Wisconsin that he was prepared to compare his own performance during the World War with that of any other man, living or dead, at any time. The moral relativists, such as Karl Marx, simply eviscerate Klio and turn her into a sterile whore³⁴⁰.

Wilson became a fanatic when it came to favoring Jewish Bolshevism, which had never won or would never win a free election in Russia. Wilson claimed that Bolshevism "fulfilled the wishes of the majority of the Russian people"³⁴. This claim would only have been true if those wishes had included being ruled, beaten, starved and murdered by Jews and, on top of that, abandoning national traditions and Christian customs in favor of mindless

atheism and mass collectivism. The old Russia perished in 1917 and never rose again. In typical Wilsonian language, the wishes of the majority of the Russian people were spoken of, while in reality the wishes of the majority of the Jewish people were meant.

It is a fact that, with the exception of the English oligarchy, Wilson despised and loathed all the non-Jewish European peoples he was supposedly trying to help and save. Wilson's inflammatory remarks about the French, Italians, Germans, Spanish, Irish, Hungarians, Poles, Russians and Romanians are legion and all stemmed (as with FDR) from his total disregard and lack of interest in these peoples. Nor did Wilson ever feel any particular sympathy for the masses of the American people, especially those of the Midwest, the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific Coast. Only the English master class and the Jews did he regard as the so-called salt of the earth - for example, when in 1900 he stupidly berated the Boers for doubting the supposed merits of British martial law and terror.

The armistice fraud of 1918

Wilson's shabby treachery during the prelude to the 1918 armistice in Europe began when the first German diplomatic note of October 3 was delivered by a Swiss delegation to the U.S. State Department on October 6, 1918. The German message was direct and simple enough: Germany wanted a military armistice on the basis of Wilson's Fourteen Points of January 9, 1918. Wilson's initial response was little more than an ambiguous and polite misdirection, but on October 23 he went public with his demand for a German revolution as a precondition for his Fourteen Points. This represented an unprecedented sadistic interference in the domestic politics of another country³⁴².

Wilson then employed an infamous lie on November 5 by claiming in a note to the German Empire that England, France and Italy, whose secret treaties had been recognized by Wilson in wartime, had agreed that in the event of a German revolution all fourteen points should apply, except point 2 on freedom of the seas, which Prime Minister Lloyd George had informed Wilson that England would never accept. The fact was, however, that on November 3 in Paris Wilson's personal emissary, Colonel House, had approached the representatives of England, France and Italy for an ambiguous agreement, according to which it should be permitted to hold out the prospect of the application of the Fourteen Points. This was confirmed by the fact that Prime Minister Clemenceau never bothered to read through the Fourteen Points-he did so only after the infamous armistice of November 11, 1918, concluded with representatives of the revolutionary Marxist regime in Germany. The latter had taken power from the demoralized, disunited and partly disloyal Hohenzollern regime (the

disloyalty of military leaders Hindenburg and Groener to the Kaiser) on 9 November in response to Wilson's calls for overthrow on 23 October and 5 November³⁴³.

The whole episode represents a case of the worst treachery and extreme duplicity on Wilson's part-without any mitigating circumstances. That the English Prime Minister Bute abandoned Frederick the Great in the middle of the Seven Years' War because England had achieved her aims in India and Canada-a move that almost cost Frederick his throne and his life-was surpassed by Wilson's infamy in 1918 when he pretended to conclude an armistice with Germany on a basis that was not even recognized as existing by the Allied belligerents.

There is no example in all of human history of a fraud on such a grandiose scale as that committed by Wilson in 1918. The eternal responsibility before the judgment of history lies with Wilson alone, and all the more so because the U.S. Senate refused to approve the corrupt Peace of Versailles, which was established in 1919 with Wilson's personal enthusiastic approval on the basis of Wilson's 1918 deception. Wilson had eclipsed all other Allied leaders as the chief war criminal, including British Foreign Secretary Grey, who, with the support of Secretary of State Crowe and the Permanent Foreign Office, was instrumental in instigating the First World War - after a dozen years of careful planning. Given Frank Roosevelt's own criminal ambitions, which were evident long before 1919, it is not surprising that he idolized Wilson.

Wilson's morbid euphoria on the day the armistice with Germany came into effect was typical: "It is now our joyful duty ... to assist in the establishment of a just democracy throughout the world."³⁴⁴ Further explanatory definitions of what Wilson meant by democracy at that time are superfluous in view of the fact that he regarded the tyranny of Bolshevism in Russia, which had been established by Lenin's violent coup on November 7, 1917, as the most exemplary democracy in the world³⁴⁵.

One thinks of Frank Roosevelt's desperately dishonest attempt to make the Soviet Union, tormented by purges, palatable to the Americans in 1941 and 1942. He even went so far as to spread the lie in public that the Soviet persecution of Christians in Russia had ceased³⁴⁶. Wilson and FDR shared other characteristics in addition to their identical ideology: They were both unsurpassable liars and hysterical and fanatics who, while obsessed with personal security, were completely indifferent to the suffering and death of those countless people, including women, children and the elderly-unless they were England-friendly Americans, Jews or English oligarchs.

Wilson at Versailles

With his two short visits to Europe in the first half of 1919, Wilson finally

visited the continent which - in contrast to England, which he had visited for the first time in 1892 - had always been a region of the world that failed to interest him. On June 29, 1919, he left Brest/France by ship, exactly one day after the Treaty of Versailles had been signed by the German delegation, without any discussion of the terms having been allowed. Wilson was delighted and satisfied by the barbaric restrictions imposed on the German delegates. He left Europe without return, having caused as much destruction as possible³⁴⁷

Wilson's ship docked in Hoboken, New Jersey, on July 8. Two days later, Wilson personally delivered the book-thick text of the shameful treaty to the Senate in defiance of custom. Some of the senators had already seen the treaty beforehand, as Wilson had telegraphed an advance copy of the text to J. P. Morgan, who had already shown it to some of his favorites among the senators. On July 10, Wilson announced in the Senate that the treaty was perfect in its present form. He imperiously demanded that the Senate approve the treaty without all American additional conditions^{He3}

Only an examination of Wilson's sanity could explain how he could have expected all this after his candidates had been defeated in the 1918 congressional elections, a Republican majority of Wilson opponents had been restored in the Senate, and treaties with foreign countries, large or small, required Senate approval by a two-thirds majority. An example of the mood in the Senate in July 1919 is the fact that Senator William Borah "regarded the League of Nations (which was part of the treaty) as an absolute evil and had fought it with all his strength since February 1919"³⁴⁹ William Borah was soon to succeed Henry Cabot Lodge as chairman of the influential Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Duroselle notes that Wilson then suffered from the same "extreme obstinacy" that had characterized his disastrous and self-destructive struggle against Dean Andrew West ten years earlier, "back at Princeton, who had more supporters than Wilson among the former Princeton students³⁵⁰ Most outrageous to Duroselle was the fact that the Treaty of Versailles violated every one of Wilson's Fourteen Points, and the American people, like Germany, had fallen for the deception that the treaty would conform to the points.

Nevertheless, in those last few weeks before he became permanently insane, Wilson insisted that the Versailles travesty was "a treaty which he considered satisfactory. "³⁵ Wilson also indulged in the self-delusion that - despite his overwhelming personal defeat in the American election of 1918 - "the great majority of public opinion was in favor of the New Diplomacy and the League of Nations. "³⁵² In response to a direct question at his press conference on July 19, he replied with a presumptuous injunction: "The Senate will ratify. He answered a direct question at his press conference on July 19 with a presumptuous decree: "The Senate will ratify the treaty. "³⁵³ Wilson's

statement to the French ambassador Jusserand on the same day was even more blatant: "The Senate must swallow its medicine."354

The US Senate rejects Wilson's peace

Due to the Republican majority in the Senate, the decision to approve or reject the bill lay with Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts. The latter hated Wilson because of his incessant attacks on the late former President Teddy Roosevelt, who had been one of Lodge's oldest and best friends. Moreover, Lodge, the Harvard historian, had no respect for the published work of his Princeton colleague. He had repeatedly criticized Wilson's work as completely lacking in academic merit and originality of any kind. Lodge attributed Teddy's death in 1919, before the contract was signed, as much to Wilson's harassment as to the tropical disease Teddy had contracted on a trip to the Amazon basin in Brazil.

Under these circumstances, Lodge reacted to Wilson's presumptuous attempt to dictate his will to the US Senate as a strong and healthy bull would react to the red rag waved by a clumsy amateur matador. In short, Lodge was itching for a decisive showdown with Wilson, and the more Wilson emphasized that the approval of the treaty was of unique and epochal historical significance³⁵⁵ Lodge had been a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for twenty-three years, whereas Wilson's entire political career spanned nine years. Lodge was annoyed that a man he regarded as vindictive, dishonest, incompetent, presumptuous and a political upstart was trying to lecture him³⁵⁶.

Lodge was an expert on US public opinion, he had his feelers out in all directions and knew that Wilson increased his personal unpopularity throughout the country every time he opened his mouth in public. Likewise, FDR's unpopularity increased during the final months of World War II, and there is every reason to believe that had he not died in the arms of one of his mistresses at the age of 63 before the war was over, his unpopularity would have steadily increased after the war in geometric proportion, as it did for Wilson, especially since news of his diplomatic incompetence was already making the American press before the end of 1945. Wilson became mentally ill at the age of 63, Frank Roosevelt had his fatal stroke at the same age and died³⁵⁷.

Despite the wishful thinking of journalists like Walter Lippmann and court historians like Basil Rauch, Wilson did not even come close to getting the U.S. Senate to approve his treaty. His disciples Cox and Frank Roosevelt, who campaigned for approval as Democratic candidates in the 1920 presidential election, suffered the biggest defeat that candidates from a major American party had ever experienced since the end of the Civil War³⁵⁸.

Wilson gave his so-called "last speech" in Pueblo/Colorado on September 29, 1919. A few days earlier, he had been frightened in Los Angeles by an argument between one of his mistresses, Mrs. Peck, and his second wife Edith. The latter let Mrs. Peck know that she would receive no more hush money. Mrs. Peck claimed that she needed the money and that she would expose horny old Woody if she didn't get it³⁵⁹. Wilson had already made several speeches before he arrived in Pueblo. Not knowing what else to do in the face of the Senate's stiff opposition, he had traveled the United States for several weeks with the intention of stirring up the American public against the Senate. The masses were not interested and the results were always poor. Columbus, Ohio, for example, had a population of 300,000 at the time, but only 4,000 people listened to Wilson's speech, which had been announced well in advance. Even this small group was not enthusiastic, and the applause at the end was brief and mechanical.

During each week of his trip, Wilson only made himself more ridiculous, apart from the trouble with Mrs. Peck. His speeches were always repetitions of the same inane drivel: Versailles represented a "great and just peace, exactly in accord with American ideals", and the League of Nations Treaty was "the greatest man-made document of all time³⁶⁰". More and more Americans came to the conclusion that Wilson was already mad during the weeks before his final collapse in Pueblo³⁶¹.

A few days before the Pueblo fiasco, William Bullitt told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that Secretary of State Lansing had informed him that Versailles was a mistake and that "most of the treaty was miserable." ³⁶² Bullitt had been with Wilson at Versailles and had been assigned to fulfill a mission in the Soviet Union as Wilson's personal emissary. Wilson reacted to Lansing and Bullitt with a typically immature and hysterical fit of rage. He described their statements in the language of a boxer (which he himself had never been) as a "punch below the belt³⁶³". Later, Bullitt was FDR's favorite diplomat in Europe, but he doubted (as he told me in his Washington, D.C., home in 1947) whether FDR was even sane during the last five years of his life. Meanwhile, Lansing, recognizing that Wilson was ill and hysterical, sent a friendly reconciliation telegram to him a few days before Pueblo, but it only served to increase Wilson's anger. He refused to respond³⁶⁴.

It would not be fair to criticize Wilson's actions after Pueblo, when he was no longer fully sane. Edith Wilson and Wilson's physician, Dr. Grayson, kept him out of the public eye while Attorney General Mitchell Palmer took over the de facto government for the next 18 months. Palmer declared it a sacred mission to fight the Bolshevik Red Menace, which he believed was invading the U.S. after

the November 1918 armistice just as it had done with Germany after the December 1917 German-Soviet armistice. Palmer, who had been appointed by Wilson but had no electoral mandate (yet pretended to have one, just as Gerald Ford later did), did many unlawful and crazy things during those 18 months. For example, he had a large number of American citizens who had never been to Russia deported to the Soviet Union on the so-called Soviet Ark, an American prison ship³⁶⁵.

But most despicable of all was Palmer's plan to have the deranged Woody Wilson run for a third term as president in 1920, with the intention that Palmer could then continue his despotic rule for another four years. Palmer could truthfully claim that he undertook this unsuccessful maneuver on the orders of the ailing president, for as Duroselle noted after the most careful research, "it seems certain that Wilson would have liked to have been elected president a third time."³⁶⁶ FDR also began to suffer from the haunting of a third term seventeen years later. A third term was contrary to the American tradition of Washington and Jefferson. Much to the undoing of humanity, FDR won his second and third re-elections with ease due to the exclusion of the real issues from the 1940 and 1944 presidential campaigns.

Wilson's legacy

When the 1920 Democratic Party convention nominated Governor James Cox and Frank Roosevelt (as vice presidential candidate) on a pro-League of Nations platform, William Jennings Bryan, who was only 60 years old and had already distinguished himself as the leader of the Democratic Party for 24 years, made a desperate and hapless attempt to bring the carefully selected convention delegates back to reality. Bryan emphasized in his speech to the convention that the whole idea of the League of Nations was complete nonsense, but reaped only scorn and derision from the agents of the plutocratic miscreants, who naturally viewed the League of Nations as a means of promoting American imperialism abroad. He was insulted as "old Bryan", although he was four years younger than Wilson, the originator of the League of Nations narrative. The latter was held in high esteem by the hand-picked Convention delegates, despite his mental illness and general unpopularity. After the 1920 fiasco, Bryan left the Democratic Party for good, which could just as easily have been due to its perfidy and incompetence during the so-called Wilson era³⁶⁷. After analyzing several aspects of the moral and political shipwreck that the Wilson era brought about, Duroselle correctly concluded that "the postwar United States has never been the same as it was in 1913, nor could it ever be again"³⁶⁸.

Duroselle recognized the plutocratic impact of World War I in transforming

the US within a few short years through the deus-ex-machina performance of the god of war. Like Tsarist Russia before 1914, the US had been a traditional debtor nation. Total American foreign investment in 1914 was only 50 percent of European investment in the US. After 1918, the USA became the world's main creditor. In 1927, total American investment abroad amounted to 350 percent of total foreign investment in the USA³⁶⁹. In addition, shortly before the Great Depression of 1929, Europe owed the USA 10.3 billion dollars in war debts, almost half of which was borrowed from the British³⁷⁰. But these were only aspects of economic imperialism, which in no way justified Woody Wilson's attempt to forever burden the US with an unnatural foreign policy of meddling in European affairs. Certainly LaFollette emphasized in his 1924 presidential campaign the importance of revising the Treaty of Versailles for world peace, but his intention in doing so was to erase old moral debts of the US to Europe by righting as much of the wrongs done to Europe by Wilson as possible.

LaFollette had no interest in creating political ties between the USA and Europe once the disgraceful Treaty of Versailles had been reviewed and then abolished. Bernard Baruch, however, the self-proclaimed elder statesman, a wealthy man who had risen to supreme power with Wilson's help and whom no American president after Wilson resisted until his death during the Kennedy era, tried repeatedly in the years from 1921 to 1933 to involve Wilson's successors Harding, Coolidge and Hoover in the European affairs according to principles that Baruch and Wilson had envisaged as a permanent project. However, the three Republican presidents between Wilson and FDR avoided becoming entangled in Europe, including the permanent military alliance with England that Baruch and Wilson had called for. They conducted American foreign policy according to the principles expressed in the American referendum of 1920 - an election in which the Wilson-Baruch interventionists were defeated by a majority of more than 7 million votes³⁷¹.

Although Hoover had contributed to the Wilson administration in the areas of food supply and aid to Europe, none of these three Republican presidents could be described as a disciple of Wilson in any respect. There was therefore reason to hope that the curse of Wilsonism had been overcome in the USA. But all that changed with the American economic crisis of 1929 and the rise of Frank Roosevelt. The worst effects of the Wilsonian legacy were yet to come.

Chapter six

FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT'S PRESIDENCY

The Wilson disciple's rise to power

Frank Roosevelt said of Herbert Hoover in 1920, when it was not yet certain whether the World War II hero of the Belgian Relief would join the Democrats or the Republicans: "I can think of no better president." ¹ The same FDR, ten years later, irresponsibly blamed Hoover for the Great Depression of 1929. Unlike Roosevelt, Hoover had warned of the danger even before Black Thursday, October 24, 1929. "Hoover's career came to an end as a result of the economic crisis in the 1932 elections." ² Jewish banker Otto Kahn was more honest than FDR in his remarks to the U.S. Senate in 1932 about the causes of the Depression; he attributed the collapse to misguided monetary policy and stated flatly, "We wanted to rule the whole world." ³

Duroselle agrees that there was an undeniable drive by American bankers at the time "to control the world economy. He anticipated some later remarks by John Kenneth Galbraith, the chief official economist of the United States during the Roosevelt era, that the flawed financial policies, especially as regards American, French and German concessions to England, to prop up the highly inflationary British pound, caused the excessive stock market speculation and borrowing in the American money market that triggered the worldwide collapse, which within months had cost \$40 billion in exchange rates, to prop up the highly inflationary British pound, caused the excessive stock market speculation and borrowing on the American money market that triggered the worldwide collapse that caused \$40 billion in currency losses within a few months and resulted in a rapid decline in production, consumption and employment in much of Europe and the US ⁶.

Only 5 percent of American national income was accounted for by foreign trade. America's system of high protective tariffs shut out much of the foreign competition, creating a closed domestic market that relied on inferior American

goods. However, the decline in total American exports from 5.1 billion dollars in 1929 to 1.5 billion in 1933 was a clear indicator of the development of world trade under the influence of the US manufactured economic crisis 1.

The victory of Frank Roosevelt-whose political career had been carefully groomed for years by another Wilson disciple, Louis Howe-in the 1932 presidential election led to erratic policies, public waste, astronomical government debt, and radical experiments in foreign policy. FDR practiced the same deception in 1932 as Wilson had twenty years earlier in 1912: if elected, he made a binding promise to spend less money than Hoover and to irrevocably, if belatedly, accept the results of the 1920 American referendum in foreign policy. He agreed to shun the League of Nations and the Versailles system, which was still intact in Europe - thanks to the intransigence of the former Allies and the servility of Weimar Germany - and he also wanted to keep away from all entanglements in alliances with foreign countries⁸.

Like Teddy Roosevelt and Woody Wilson, Frank Roosevelt never kept the promises he made to individual American politicians, such as Al Smith or Jim Farley, or to American plutocratic evildoers he sought to influence, such as Randolph Hearst Sr. or Joseph Kennedy Sr. In this area, Frank Roosevelt was extremely unscrupulous and cynical. He also enjoyed telling unvarnished lies to the entire American population about vital issues such as US national security. In terms of willful deception, he can best be compared to Stalin, a foreign leader he admired immensely for years. From 1905 to 1913, after his graduation from Harvard and a one-year law course at Columbia University, he spent his time as a landowner, a nominal Wall Street lawyer, and an active speculator. He did the same again from 1921 to 1928, after his eight years in the US Navy Department. In 1928, he used Al Smith, the New York State Democratic chairman, to win two two-year terms as governor of New York in Albany (just as Nelson Rockefeller later used the Jewish GOP boss of New York, Senator Jacob Javits, to win the same office).

Roosevelt and Hopkins

It was not until 1928 that he met Harry Hopkins, the man who was to become his closest friend at the peak of his career. Hopkins was of English descent, was born in Sioux City, Iowa, and died at the age of 55 in January 1946. He studied at Grinnell College in Iowa from 1908-1912, where his lifelong worldview was shaped by Ed Steiner, a left-wing Jewish professor who came from the ghetto in Prague. Hopkins had no career plan after graduating from the small Midwestern college. He wanted to go to the Pacific Coast, but Steiner persuaded him to pursue a job in social welfare on New York City's Jewish East Side instead⁹.

Hopkins married Ethel Gross, a Jewish woman, in 1913, and the couple had four children^ Hopkins was released from military service during World War I because he was working for the Red Cross in the southern United States. During the 1920s, he continued his social work in New York City with Dr. Jacob Goldberg and the Milbank Fund. He met Frank Roosevelt and supported his first New York gubernatorial campaign in 1928. After the American stock market crash, Governor Frank Roosevelt persuaded the legislature in Albany to create the New York State Temporary Emergency Relief Administration. Jesse Isidor Strauss, the president of the Macy's department store company, became the nominal head of the new agency, but Hopkins, as his first deputy, actually had a close relationship with FDR, and it became a permanent collaboration.

Roosevelt's first presidential election victory on November 8, 1932, "filled Hopkins with hope"^ FDR appointed Hopkins chairman of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration on May 22, 1933,¹⁵ and initiated the closest possible cooperation between Hopkins and Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau, Jr. Although Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes was appalled by the waste and frivolity of Hopkins' programs, FDR and Morgenthau made sure that Ickes always got the short end of the stick in his disputes with Hopkins. FDR sent Hopkins on an official trip to England, Germany, Austria and Italy in 1934^ Hopkins claimed in one of his reports to FDR that Mussolini had "eyes like a monkey"^ Hopkins assisted in writing the Roosevelt speeches upon his return and was all too willing and eager to take the place of R_oosevelt's most important advisor, the "little gnome Louis Howe", when he died in 1935

Hopkins became Roosevelt's alter ego, and (Roosevelt's wife) "Eleanor knew nothing of his advice. "²⁰^ The outcry of indignation following FDR's Chicago Bridge speech on October 5, 1937, about the possibility of the United States re-entering the war left Roosevelt lamenting, "It's terrible when you try to lead and you look around - and there's nobody there. "²¹ The following month, he and Hopkins went on a cruise to the Caribbean in a depressed mood. On their return, Hopkins had to have two-thirds of his stomach removed because of cancer, but the public was told it was only stomach ulcers²²^

Future American war operations were discussed and planned by Roosevelt and Hopkins in 1938, at a time when Hopkins was already secretly transferring money from social relief funds to military programs²³^ FDR appointed Hopkins as Secretary of Commerce in January 1939²⁴ Hopkins also became the closest of friends with Bernard Baruch, alongside Churchill in England, whom he had known since Wilson's death²⁵^ Hopkins' first speech as Secretary of Commerce in Des Moines, Iowa, on February 24, 1939, was typical of his constant public warmongering: "The world seems to have gone almost mad. February 1939 was typical of his constant public war-mongering: "We are in a world that seems to have gone almost mad in a chaos of hatred and fear. "²⁶

Churchill had written to Baruch in 1938: "Very soon there will be war. We will be involved in it and so will you. You will play the leading part over there."27 Hopkins was with Baruch at his Hobcaw Barony estate in South Carolina when Chamberlain gave his warmongering speech in Birmingham on March 17, 1939. Hopkins assured Baruch that he was in favor of American military operations in Europe as soon as possible28^

"From the beginning" Hopkins was "privy to the development of the atomic bomb29^ By June 1940, it had become a major focus of aggressive American military planning. Hopkins agreed with FDR in September 1940 "that there is nothing more important in the world today than defeating Hitler."30 The following month, Hopkins disagreed that Roosevelt's presidential campaign needed a promise: "Your sons will not be sent into any foreign wars."31

Rapprochement with the Soviet Union

It may well be that the shared admiration of Stalin was what cemented the ongoing collaboration and friendship between Hopkins and FDR^^ But there were other American radicals, more sophisticated and educated than Hopkins, who shared this point of view. A close perusal of Hopkins' correspondence reveals an ignorance, immaturity, and lowliness of thought almost unimaginable for a man in that position. That such a man could become Roosevelt's chosen favorite is the best revelation about FDR himself. Their collaboration became a classic example of limitless power in its deepest abyss.

John D. Rockefeller Sr. did not die until 1937 at the age of 98, but had already transferred a large part of the company management to his only son, John D. Rockefeller Jr. in 1914, who in turn had five sons of his own, and then the overall management in 192333. FDR knew that in the 1920s the Rockefeller clan, under the chairmanship of John D. Jr. and his Jewish assistant Abraham Flexner, had commissioned Ivy Lee, the most brilliant of all anonymous lobbyists and public relations specialists, to bring about the American diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union, which had been established in a depressed Russia by Bolshevism with the help of Woody Wilson, world Jewry and British imperialism.

Wilson himself delayed diplomatic recognition of the USSR because he was anxious to conceal from the American people his leading role in 1917 in the creation of the Bolshevik regime. Wilson, along with Lloyd George and Clemenceau, had sabotaged the meager military support for the White Russians in the Russian Civil War of 1917-1920 - a war that cost twice as many Russian lives as the disastrous Russian participation in the First World War. Allied help was just enough to enable the Reds to blacken the Whites in a worldwide

propaganda campaign, while much real help from Western leaders went to the Reds, either because they believed in Bolshevism, as Wilson did, or because they made the same mistake as Lloyd George did in the French Revolution of 1789 and assumed that a revolutionary regime would make Russia weak and all but helpless.

Although Wilson's successors Harding, Coolidge and Hoover were genuine opponents of Bolshevism and had nothing to hide compared to Wilson's secret support for the Bolsheviks, they did not consider diplomatic recognition, even though they knew that it was customary under international law to recognize ideological regimes that one detested as soon as they had de facto power - as was clearly the case with the USSR after the end of the Civil War in 1921. Nevertheless, Wilson's successors came to the conclusion that the openly proclaimed ideological war of the Soviet Union and the Comintern - the executive organ of the 111th International - against all non-communist governments of the world denied the Soviet Union the status of a member of the international community. Harding, Coolidge and Hoover were not in the least deterred by the fact that England, Japan, Germany, France and Italy, i.e. the other great powers of the world, did not share their view. The American diplomatic stance before 1933 of not recognizing the USSR was therefore extremely controversial.

Roosevelt was well aware of this important problem, of the Rockefellers' efforts to change American foreign policy in favor of the USSR, and of the fact that he could not give in to his own inclinations to openly advocate US participation in the Geneva League of Nations, as he had done from 1919 to 1932, since he was dependent on the domestic support of Bill Hearst, Jack Garner and Jim Farley. He therefore initially concentrated on the issue of diplomatic recognition of the USSR. Behind the façade of mere recognition lay his intention to become the secret ally of Josef Stalin and the Soviet Union as quickly as possible and before the end of 1933³⁴.

The close relationship between former Lenin supporter Bill Bullitt and Roosevelt broke down when Bullitt finally realized the folly of this Soviet-American alliance policy. As late as 1933, Bill Bullitt was the willing tool in Roosevelt's pro-Stalin conspiracy. Consequently, Bullitt - the model for the Lanny Budd of pro-Soviet US author Upton Sinclair's novels - became Roosevelt's first US ambassador to the Soviet Union from 1933 to 1936.

In short, in 1933 FDR took advantage of the fact that the United States had denied the Soviet Union full diplomatic recognition for sixteen years. But while in 1933 he pretended merely to end the reactionary diplomatic policies of his predecessors, which had been at odds with the diplomatic practices of the other great powers, he used the intense diplomatic negotiations surrounding recognition (including the thorny issue of old Russian debts to the US, which

Lenin and Stalin had refused to pay) to move in one step from non-recognition of the Soviet Union to a full secret alliance with Stalin. He also supported - and all the more effectively because it was done so secretly - the campaign of the Soviet Foreign Commissioner Litvinov-Finkelstein to have the Soviet Union admitted to the League of Nations, with the intention of subordinating it to Soviet purposes. Litvinov was able to achieve this admission of the USSR to the League of Nations a few weeks after the American-Soviet Recognition Treaty and the secret alliance of November 1933³⁶.

The Manchurian War of 1929

To understand this interplay between Roosevelt and Stalin and the Soviet Union's entry into the League of Nations, the background of events in the Far East is significant. In 1929, the Soviet Union had put an end to the brief illusion that any kind of international collective security could develop in the post-World War I era. This illusion began in 1923 after the failure of the second major communist coup attempt in Germany³⁷.

In the first major international war since the First World War, the Soviets fought victoriously against National China in Manchuria for eight months in 1929. When Hoover's Secretary of State Henry Stimson tried to use the Kellogg-Briand Pact, which had just been concluded in 1928, against Moscow (a pact that was incorrectly used at Nuremberg in 1946 to condemn the German leadership of World War II), the Soviet Foreign Commissar Chicherin (Litvinov's predecessor) pointed out some basic facts. The USSR had not co-signed the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Stimson had no right to appeal to the Soviet Union at all, since the USA had not recognized the USSR regime. The Soviet Union insisted that its operations in Manchuria were defensive measures to preserve old rights that Tsarist Russia had acquired in Manchuria. The USSR had inherited these rights from the Tsarist regime. The Kellogg-Briand Pact would only outlaw war as an instrument of national policy. Although Chicherin did not give any examples of this, he meant war in the sense that Lord Halifax later used it as an instrument of national policy in 1938-1939. The Pact did not outlaw war when it was a defensive measure.

In fact, the USA had excluded all of Latin America from the scope of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, the British Empire its entire so-called outer sphere of influence (meaning countries not formally annexed by the Empire but under British control). France had excluded all its European alliance obligations from the effectiveness of the pact. In Chicherin's view, it was therefore moderate of the Soviet Union to limit its war to Manchuria, the scene of Russian advances during the Boxer Rebellion of 1900, the main theater of operations in the Russo-

Japanese War of 1904-1905, and above all a region that had been definitively divided into Japanese and Russian spheres of interest in treaties of 1907 and 1910. Because the 1929 Soviet victory in Manchuria prompted the Japanese to undertake their own campaigns in Manchuria two years later, and because, according to FDR's mythology, only the alleged political right-wing aggressors Japan, Germany, and Italy destroyed the supposedly glorious peace and collective security after World War I in World War II, the Sino-Soviet War of 1929 has generally not been mentioned in American secondary school, college, and university history textbooks since 1945. Thus, a war that was vividly present to the American people of 1929 was allowed to fall into academic oblivion because it did not fit into FDR's World War II propaganda picture³⁸

Hoover's disastrous trade policy

The Japanese Empire had a moderate and liberal leadership when the US-manufactured Great Depression hit in 1929. Prime Minister Yuko Hamaguchi persuaded Emperor Hiro- hito to ratify the 1930 London Naval Disarmament Treaty, which limited the cruiser tonnage of the world's largest fleets, even though the treaty favored Britain and the US over Japan by a wide margin and Admiral Kato, the powerful Chief of Staff of the Japanese Navy, was against it. Foreign Minister Schidehara pointed out this liberal Japanese behavior when negotiating with the US for trade relief, but President Hoover and Secretary of State Stimson made a big mistake when they did not oppose the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1931, which turned the US into a veritable autarky and erected protective tariff walls so high that only very few European and Japanese imports could climb them. Foreign products no longer had any chance on the American market in terms of price.

This mistake by the US Congress could have been stopped by Hoover's presidential veto. The American farm bloc, made up of the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Farmers' Union, opposed the tariff because they knew that foreign countries would retaliate for American economic policies directed against international trade by rejecting American agricultural imports just when there were huge surpluses in the United States. American farmers, unlike the post-1933 period, received no aid or price subsidies from the government. Hoover knew that the Smoot-Hawley tariff legislation was a creature of the powerful National Association of Manufacturers, a lobby beholden to the industrial and financial plutocratic evildoers whose attitude toward the American farmer was bluntly expressed by Calvin Coolidge, Hoover's Republican predecessor: Farmers all over the world have always been poor people who are not expected to make much money.

In short, the Smoot-Hawley tariff, which exacerbated the economic depression in Europe and Japan, was a kind of coercive tax on the downtrodden

masses of the US and abroad, solely for the benefit of the tiny US plutocratic oligarchy. The enormous loss to the small investor when the American stock market collapsed mostly left the oligarchs cold. Now and then they temporarily propped up this and that stock to save their own investments without loss, and Bernard Baruch even skimmed extra dollars from this catastrophe of the American people and slipped them to Winston Churchill, the chief lobbyist for world Jewry in England (where some of the events that were instrumental in creating the economic crisis also took place³⁹).

Hoover imagined that his veto, which would have stopped the lobby of the National Association of Manufacturers (because opposition from the Farm Bloc could not muster the necessary two-thirds majority in Congress to override the veto), this veto, Hoover believed, would prevent his re-election in 1932. He was also convinced that the public spending program of his Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which consisted of government aid to small and large businesses in the United States to create jobs, could deal with the Depression without the need to adopt more radical policies advocated by many Democrats.

Hoover as scapegoat for the economic crisis

Had Hoover been as skilled in American politics as he was as a civil engineer and in public administration, he would have realized that his defeat in 1932 was inevitable anyway from the moment the Depression hit in his first year as president. American history is full of parallel examples that suggested this conclusion. For example, Andrew Jackson was more popular than Washington or Jefferson during his two terms in office (1829-1837). Martin van Buren, the Dutchman from New York appointed by Jackson to succeed him, was a shrewd politician with enormous personal influence at the time of his inauguration - but the fact that a major economic crisis occurred during his first year as president precluded the possibility of re-election in 1840. The opposing Whigs won the election hands down.

President Grover Cleveland was the first to admit that the economic crisis of 1893, which occurred as soon as Cleveland succeeded Republican President Benjamin Harrison, was likely to keep the Democrats out of the White House for many years after the 1896 presidential election. This prediction was correct: although the Democrats returned to the White House in 1913 after sixteen years, Wilson received only a minority of the vote in the 1912 election, and his victory was only made possible by the fact that Teddy Roosevelt had split the opposing Republican Party in order to eliminate LaFollette.

If Hoover had had any political acumen, he would have known by 1931 that the time was past when it was useful for him to play the smart politician, and he

would have concentrated instead on making statesmanlike decisions, no matter what effect this might have had on his popularity. This had been the wise course of another one-term US president three generations earlier: John Tyler of Virginia vetoed every major piece of legislation proposed by popular Senator Henry Clay, knowing that Clay's program was corrupt. Tyler's popularity plummeted, and by the end of his term he apparently had less than 10 percent popular support. In the middle of his term, he made a state visit to Rhode Island to launch a ship and was nearly killed. After that, Tyler lived in philosophical seclusion in the White House. He was a bachelor, but to make his time pleasant, as president he married a pretty young lady from a good family in Virginia. He coined the famous slogan at the time: bad luck in politics, but good luck in love.

It was just that Tyler-like John Adams, who in 1798 resisted Alexander Rarnilton's call for a U.S. war against France, which would have been popular but otherwise a disaster-that Tyler preferred to be a one-term president with some statesmanlike resolutions rather than a clever politician who cheated the people to get two terms.

With Hoover, it took the worse of the two possible endings: By letting the Smoot-Hawley tariff go through, he played the clever politician against his better judgment, but to no avail. Criticism was tied to the fact that Hitler, after his long private conversation with Herbert Hoover on March 8, 1938, was negative about Hoover's abilities, even though Roosevelt's predecessor was the exact opposite of FDR in his outspoken German-friendliness. Often overlooked is the fact that Herbert Hoover was the first US president of German descent (and Eisenhower the second, the difference between the two being that Hoover was a conservative and Eisenhower a far left radical). As a statesman, Hitler could gain no other private opinion of Hoover. As even the West German court historian and defender of the Nuremberg trials, Werner Maser, admits, Hitler was as well informed about historical and political facts as he was about Hoover's specialties of technology and administration. According to the testimony of Harvard graduate Ernst Hanfstaengl⁴⁰, Hitler probably knew more about American history than Hoover.

If FDR had run for president in 1928 ...

Hoover, the technician and administrator, also knew woefully little about the history of other countries, despite his educated wife and the fact that he had spent twenty-three years abroad in Australia, Asia, and Europe. The real tragedy was even greater than Hoover's mistake in allowing the Smoot-Hawley tariff to pass the U.S. Congress. Had not Louis Howe, which was undoubtedly right from his standpoint, gotten FDR to "pass" in 1928 and give the Democratic

presidential nomination to Al Smith - who was predestined to lose, even though he had a powerful party machine in New York, because the US was not yet ready to elect a Catholic New York Democrat who was said to lead a dissolute life of chronic alcoholism with his Jewish mistress-then Roosevelt would have run against Hoover four years earlier, in 1928. Whatever his faults, FDR was a magnetic campaigner, and Howe's expert public relations had already earned him a strong reputation. Hoover also had a good reputation in 1928, but he was a weak campaigner and a mediocre speaker who blushed easily. FDR could undoubtedly have beaten Hoover in 1928, though not by the same margin as in 1932. Had Howe agreed to Roosevelt's request to enter the 1928 campaign - Howe was FDR's political manager at the time until Harry Hopkins took over that role - Roosevelt would have become the one-term president instead of Hoover, whom the Depression of 1929 would have finished off. In 1932, Hoover would have defeated any Democratic opponent. The US would have had a pro-German president in the White House during Hitler's first eight years in office, from 1933 to 1941, instead of the German-hater FDR, and Hoover would undoubtedly have been in a position to choose his own successor.

And of course, under these circumstances, Halifax would never have dared to launch his campaign of military aggression against Germany in 1939. Consequently, the Second World War would never have taken place. Hitler would have been able to carry out his program of territorial revision in Europe unhindered. From 1940 at the latest, Hitler could have spent the remaining years of his life on the things that mattered most to him: public works and the peaceful reconstruction of Germany. The Soviet Union would not have dared to expand its slave empire over a large part of Europe and Asia. Although Bolshevism would probably not have collapsed from within under Stalin's tight reins, it would certainly have been held in check by the cordon sanitaire that had been established after the First World War and temporarily reinforced and secured by Hitler's seizure of power in Germany in 1933. Instead of a blind century characterized by betrayal, despair and decline, the middle of the 20th century would have unfolded as a golden age of peace, abundance and prosperity for much of the world.

But despite all this, there were intellectuals like Leo Tolstoy⁴¹ in Russia and like the Jewish philosopher Sidney Hook in the USA⁴² who deny the historical role of the individual and claim that everything is the product of blind deterministic and materialistic forces. One can agree with this on one point: When the creative hero is rejected by one of the many errors of judgment with which the annals of world history are littered, as Hitler was rejected in 1945, then the blind materialistic forces do indeed take control, at least temporarily. This is what happened when they transformed the glorious dream of John Scotus Erigena forty-five generations earlier into the gloom and darkness of the 20th

century after 1945, the true blind century of human history, to which Roman decline and Jewish agitation and subversion at the time of Christ seem like a Garden of Gethsemane.

The real causes of Japan's expansionist policy

Japan tacitly agreed to the unequal distribution of the fleet, as contained in the Washington Pact of the Five Naval Powers of 1921 for the battleships and in the London Three-Power Fleet Agreement of 1930 for the cruisers. The Japanese had joined the Washington Nine-Power Treaty of 1921, which secured the status quo in China and the Pacific region. But the Japanese, of all people, were not simple altruists who governed their small country with the idea of giving away what little they had. On the contrary, under both liberal and conservative leadership, the Japanese played the quid pro quo and expected some advantages in return for their concessions to the chauvinism and arrogance of the Anglo-Americans, namely that Japan, as a rising industrial power with scarce raw materials but a skilled workforce, should have the right to a larger share of world trade.

The new crisis that began to emerge in US-Japanese relations in 1931 was not due to a sudden departure from Japanese policy - as claimed by Secretary of State Henry Stimson's propaganda lie, which was intended to conceal the US's guilt, the crisis was entirely the result of American tariff policy, which had turned the US into a total autarky in one fell swoop and destroyed any chance for Japan to gain a better foothold in the American market, despite the fact that the US had been Japan's major trading partner before 1931 .:

Later, when FDR became president, the Smoot-Hawley tariff was allowed to remain in effect. FDR deliberately torpedoed the London World Economic Conference of 1933, which was intended to improve world trade. What Roosevelt did with tariffs after 1933 was typical: he allowed his Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, and his Treasury Secretary, Morgenthau, to use the tariff as a political soccer. The only exceptions to its strict provisions were so-called bilateral trade agreements with favored countries. In exchange for what was granted in these agreements, the US always demanded political and economic concessions, and American tariff favoritism policy became a system of imperialist coercion and ideological boycott, as in the case of FDR's tariff discrimination against Japan, Germany, Italy, Spain, and many other countries.

In short, Roosevelt maintained a bad tariff system that Hoover had allowed to pass for reasons of political expediency, and even made it worse. In effect, he took the tariff out of its economic sphere and made it a compliant tool of his foreign policy. Just as Richard Hofstadter had proved that the tariff, and not Negro slavery, was the cause of the aggression of the American North against the South in the American Civil War of 1861-1865, it can be argued with equal

certainly that an excessive protective tariff policy of the US after 1931 was the cause of the tension in US-Japanese relations that Roosevelt exploited a decade later to drive Japan into a desperate war of survival against the US against its will.

The Japanese intervention in Manchuria in September 1931 had its roots in Moscow - in the Sino-Soviet War of 1929 - and in Washington - in the anti-Japanese Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1931. Neither this 1931 intervention nor the attack on Pearl Harbor ten years later reveal any particular priorities or intentions on the part of Japan. The Japanese did not voluntarily follow the USA into autarky in 1931, but did so because the USA practically demanded it of them. Nor did they attack Pearl Harbor in 1941 of their own free will, but FDR left them no choice, unless you call the unconditional surrender of a proud nation without having fired a shot - which is what a Japanese acceptance of the White-Morgenthau ultimatum of November 26, 1941 would have meant - a choice.

Japan had to retreat to its own small domestic market in 1931 in order to survive. Since 1929, the Soviets had consolidated their own imperialist position in Manchuria, but free access to Manchuria's mineral resources and other sources of industrial aid became essential to the survival of the rapidly growing Japanese population after the Smoot-Hawley Tariff of 1931 deprived Japan of the hope that world trade would revive in the foreseeable future, on which Japan's prosperity and conciliatory foreign policy had been founded in the 1920s⁴⁴

Roosevelt's responsibility for the war in the Pacific

The situation was ironic given Roosevelt's viciously anti-Japanese and pro-Soviet propaganda after March 1933. When Japan had voluntarily played the role of bandit bought by the British in the Far East - during the years before the Anglo-Japanese alliance was formally terminated at the request of the US at the Washington Conference of 1921 - all this and the surprise attack on Port Arthur in February 1904 were praised to the skies in the US. However, when Japan, with no other choice, was forced to adopt an independent policy again in 1931 - which only happened as a reaction to the anti-Japanese autarky policy of the USA - first Hoover's Secretary of State Stimson and then Frank Roosevelt himself could not find enough angry words to blame Japan for a development in the Far East that had been triggered solely by a wrong policy in Washington and not in Tokyo.

Joseph Grew, FDR's ambassador to Tokyo, was a brilliant career diplomat, but too timid to publicly accuse FDR of his infamy that brought about Pearl Harbor in 1941⁴⁵. Immediately after the Japanese released Grew and his staff from luxurious internment (in return for Roosevelt's release of Japanese envoys

Nomura and Kurusu), Grew openly admitted the following to a group of Reed College scholars in Portland, Oregon, in 1942: He, as a diplomatic professional, could find no fault with Japan's foreign policy from 1931 to 1941. He also confirmed that no leading Japanese politician ever wanted to start a war with the USA. It had been Japan's right to secure the Manchurian market in the years 1931-1933. Chiang Kai-shek, not Japan, would have started the long Sino-Japanese war in 1937. Japan would have had the honest intention of ending this conflict with German mediation in 1938, the same year in which Germany withdrew its military advisors from Chiang.

The proof that Japan never wanted to annex additional territories in China itself lies in the fact that Japan recognized the Chinese regime of Wang Ching-wei in Nanking in 1940, when Chungking (i.e. Chiang Kai-shek) refused to negotiate. The bloody local defeats suffered by the Japanese at the hands of the Soviet Union in 1938 and 1939 correctly demonstrated to Tokyo that Stalin posed a mortal threat to Japan. Prime Minister Prince Konoye's offer in August 1941, after the Atlantic Conference between Roosevelt and Churchill in Canada, to meet Roosevelt in Alaska to discuss peace terms - including Japan's recognition of the territorial integrity of the Chinese mainland - demonstrated the Japanese sincere desire for peace, and this despite Roosevelt's illegal blockade of Japan in July 1941, ostensibly in retaliation for the peaceful French-Japanese negotiations over French Indochina - a matter that was of no concern to Roosevelt.

The fact that Hideki Tojo became Japanese Prime Minister in October 1941, after Roosevelt had refused to meet Konoye in Alaska, in no way meant that the Japanese had finally decided on a belligerent policy. For Tojo authorized Kurusu and Nomura in Washington to offer FDR and Hull more concessions than Konoye had made in his last, sincere attempt for a peace settlement that would have benefited the U.S. more than Japan.

This analysis by Grew in 1942 was confirmed in a public speech at Stanford in 1945 by Payson Treat, the first professional sinologist at an American university who could deal exclusively with modern diplomatic history and socio-economic developments in China and Japan. Treat, who had reported from the Far East on behalf of Harvard University during the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05, and who personally knew every major national Chinese politician from Chiang Kai-shek on down, concluded his speech with the following remark: "If only the leading American politicians had been familiar with the contents of a dozen specialized works on the Far East from his private library, the war crimes of the United States in World War II and the crimes against humanity could have been prevented.

The leading American expert on American diplomatic history, Thomas Aldrich Bailey, who had also taught it to Japanese students, confirmed Grew's

analysis and Treat's Stauforder explanations of it. Bailey did not deny his own fondness for the Japanese. He openly admitted that while he liked both Chinese and Japanese, he preferred the Japanese even more. He also challenged any critic to refute Treat's analysis on the facts alone.

Thus, the true picture of U.S.-Japanese relations between 1931 and 1941 became perfectly clear in 1945, even before a series of scholarly works by Morgenthau, Beard, Tansill, Kimmel, Theobald, Greaves, Barnes and Neumann appeared, irrefutably proving that Roosevelt was chiefly to blame for the outbreak of war with Japan in 1941, which enabled him, as an ally of Soviet Vosh Stalin, to openly attack Germany and most of Europe during World War II.

For the same reason, Grew, Treat and Bailey, as well as the aforementioned authors of the documented historical accounts, were unanimous in their opinion that neither Hitler nor the German Foreign Minister Ribbentrop had at any time urged Japan to go to war against the United States. FDR never faced an unprovoked attack or even the possibility of such an attack; rather, he was always what he most ardently wished to be: the aggressor hiding under the propaganda cloak of the glamorous wartime president.

Japan and the League of Nations

On the very day in 1931 when England abandoned the gold standard and abandoned Winston Churchill's grandiose fiscal ambitions of 1925, the Japanese security forces began to advance beyond their military occupation zones in Manchuria, which had been provided for in international treaties following the Portsmouth Peace Treaty under Teddy Roosevelt's auspices in 1905. The date of this unilateral Japanese action, without consulting the other co-signatories of the 1922 Treaty of Washington, was September 19, 1931, and Henry Stimson immediately condemned this new Japanese policy. This self-righteous product of Groton and Harvard and old friend of FDR - despite Stimson's Republican membership and service in Hoover's cabinet - hoped that he could use the Manchurian issue as a pretext to drag the US to the League of Nations negotiating table in Geneva⁴⁶.

The League of Nations was of course only acting on London's orders, and the British under Prime Minister MacDonald had not the slightest intention of opposing Japan's defensive measures against the Soviet colossus, which was also clutching northern Manchuria. The League of Nations' gesture of September 22, 1931, demanding that China and Japan refrain from hostilities was entirely platonic[^] The pugnacious Stimson, who throughout his life tirelessly argued for war at any cost,⁴⁸ was astonished that the British Embassy

in Washington reacted negatively when he raised the possibility of Anglo-American action against Japan. Because of Stalin's policy of avoiding a final confrontation in the Far East before Europe was in flames, the Soviets decided not to confront the Japanese in northern Manchuria themselves, but rather to adopt a policy of permanent undeclared war throughout the Far East in the hope that Britain and the USA, rather than the USSR, would be the first to enter into a major conflict with Japan. This hope was finally fulfilled in 1941, when the USA and England were at war with Japan, while Stalin adhered to non-warfare - until the moment of his sudden attack on Japan in August 1945.

After failing to persuade the British, Stimson pressured Hoover to begin a policy of moral and economic sanctions against Japan⁴⁹^ Hoover's sarcastic criticism of Stimson's proposal forever destroyed the relationship between the two Republican leaders and paved the way for Stimson to join Roosevelt's cabinet in 1940. Although Hoover was no dove (in the sense of a pacifist) and had personally fought on the barricades of Tientsin during the Chinese Boxer Rebellion in 1900, he could do nothing with a chauvinist hawk of Stimson's ilk. He realized that he had made a mistake when in 1928 - when the international weather had been favorable - he had offered Stimson the post of Secretary of State in exchange for Stimson's help in the 1928 presidential campaign. Stimson, for his part, developed lifelong feelings of hatred toward Hoover⁵⁰^

Stimson's hands were tied because, unlike in England, in the USA the cabinet member in charge of foreign policy cannot do anything without the president's approval. Also, unlike Grey in 1914 and Halifax in 1939, Stimson did not have a Foreign Office at his disposal that was independent of elections and on which he could rely. Therefore, Hoover's firm rejection of Stimson in 1931 eliminated any danger of American involvement against Japan in the Far East for the remainder of Hoover's administration until March 1933, by which time Japan had already consolidated its new position, dominated all of Manchuria and made China willing to negotiate. The danger of the USA becoming involved in a crisis in the Far East did not arise again until 1933, when FDR made his personal declaration of war on Germany, Italy and Japan in Chicago.

Frank/in Roosevelt's youth and political rise

Since Roosevelt was no longer able to play an active role in the Femen East in 1933 and for the time being also kept out of the League of Nations because of his election promise to Randolph Hearst senior, he was able to concentrate unhindered on his policy of rapprochement with Stalin. This policy pleased his mother, who had dominated his life more than any other person after the death of his aged father in 1901, when Frank was 19. Duroselle, the author of a

perceptive psycho-biography of Roosevelt⁵¹, saw it this way: "Sara Roosevelt was-until her death in 1941-a very demanding mother, whose wishes Frank always bowed to." ⁵²

Like many well-bred and pampered mama's boys, FDR was very active in social life, was well liked, suave, knew how to fit in and had a confident demeanor. When Wilson won the gubernatorial election in New Jersey in 1910, FDR immediately made his way to Trenton, New Jersey's capital. Within a very short time, he managed to ingratiate himself with the easily impressed Wilson, who then happily declared: "He is the best-looking young giant I have ever seen"[^]

Roosevelt actively supported Wilson at the 1912 Democratic presidential nominating convention in Baltimore. Wilson was so devoted to him that he did not mind when FDR turned down the offered post of Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in 1913 and instead demanded the post his cousin Teddy Roosevelt had received from President McKinley in 1897: Under Secretary of the Navy.

Like Wilson, FDR was a passionate supporter of England's unconditional victory and Germany's unconditional surrender from the first day of the World War^{54^} Although FDR was not interested in peacemaking himself, he did accompany Wilson to Versailles in 1919 in the role of special advisor to his personal friend and president. When he was nominated as the Democratic vice presidential candidate at the 1920 Democratic convention at the Cow Palace in San Francisco, he was forced to resign his position in the Navy Department - but only after he had invested as much money as possible in new ships^{55^}

Duroselle correctly notes that FDR probably contracted polio in 1921 and was thus kept away from politics for almost a year, but that this personal handicap turned into a political advantage for him. His life had so far been extremely pleasant and effortless. His wife Eleanor discovered his marital infidelity in 1918, but this did not bother him too much and was not made public for many years. Their last child was born in 1916. That it took a personal tragedy to create his later successful propaganda image during the Depression of 1929 - an "underdog" bravely battling a crippling disease - is telling. Although FDR was no longer plagued by physical polio pains after 1922, it was easy for him to maintain the popular image of the suffering hero, when in reality he was a relatively indolent man who enjoyed luxury and easy living and sipped with relish his daily strong martini cocktails, which he usually mixed exclusively himself. FDR's average workday at the White House was less than half as long as Hoover's had been.

FDR was an attorney for J. P. Morgan before joining the Navy:.. bureaucracy. In 1920, he became legal vice president of the Maryland Fidelity and Deposit Bank - a mostly nominal post in a Mor- gan branch bank with a good salary^{56^} Deprived of much of his usual pastimes after his polio illness, FDR cultivated

lavish hospitality. He had the same personal success with Al Smith, the New York Democratic boss of the 1920s who had first been elected governor of New York State in 1918, that he had had with Wilson a dozen years earlier. It was he, FDR, who first referred to Al Smith, the corrupt Tammany Hall politician, as the Happy Warrior (in his nominating speech for Smith at the 1924 Democratic presidential convention). Meanwhile, throughout the 1920s, FDR was constantly pushed to the left politically by his mother Sara - as a plutocratic advocate of an alliance with Bolshevism. This stance was long popular among wealthy American Jews such as FDR's neighbor in Hyde Park, Henry Morgenthau, Jr. whom Sara liked⁵⁷

Louis Howe, who shared Sara's enthusiasm for Bolshevism and had worked under FDR in the Navy Department during World War I, influenced FDR to the point that he wrote during Coolidge's presidency that the Democrats could only take back the White House if the GOP (the Republicans) "lead us into a period of severe economic depression and unemployment."⁵⁸ So, in 1928, at the age of 46, FDR "passed" and had the "Happy Warrior" Al Smith - who had failed to win the presidential nomination in 1924 - accept the nomination against Hoover in the presidential campaign. At the same time, Howe and FDR persuaded Al Smith that it would be good for his presidential election victory in New York State if he helped FDR win the governorship of that state. Smith later bitterly regretted this decision when he joined forces with Herbert Hoover in the Liberty League in 1934 and publicly accused FDR of trying to sell out the entire United States to Bolshevism⁵⁹ In the end, FDR won the governorship in 1928, but Smith did not win the state of New York in the presidential election⁶⁰.

By the end of 1929, after he had become governor of New York, Al Smith was discredited by his abysmal failure in the 1928 presidential election, and the great GOP victor, Herbert Hoover, was blamed for the Depression, FDR knew he was assured the OS presidency beginning in 1932. Thanks to Louis Howe's management, he had reached the highest goal with greater ease than any candidate before⁶¹. Thanks to the Depression, FDR won the 1930 New York gubernatorial election with a huge majority over his Republican rival. From that moment on, he was the only candidate for the presidency. Letting others handle his gubernatorial business in the capital city of Albany, New York, was not difficult during his second term. FDR's public speeches suddenly had slickness, polish and messianic traction. He had hired Samuel Rosenman, a clever Jewish judge, to write, edit and publish his public speeches⁶².

Besides Harry Hopkins, FDR's closest personal friend from the time he went to Albany was the wealthy Jewish Bolshevik and neighbor in Hyde Park, Henry Morgenthau Jr. The two remained close until FDR's death in April 1945. Morgenthau, though appointed Secretary of the Treasury, was the de facto U.S. Secretary of State from FDR's first day in the White House. Morgenthau and

Hopkins were both ardent disciples of Stalin and Bolshevism. It was impossible to say which of these two chief advisors to FDR showed the greater devotion to the Communist gospel of the extermination of all nationalities - except the Jewish - in favor of a world dictatorship under the auspices of a Jewish bureaucratic elite, like that under Alexander Dumschitz in the Soviet Union of the Leonid Brezhnev era⁶³.

The secret alliance with Stalin

After crushing Hoover in the 1932 presidential election with a 57 percent majority, FDR pretended not to care about foreign policy and endorsed so-called isolationism while secretly advancing the policy of alliance with the Soviet Union⁶⁴ In the process, he imposed an arrogant and overly bureaucratic program of state socialism on the American people and proudly proclaimed, "I will ...wage war against the Depression."⁶⁵ FDR had Secretary of State Cordell Hull, his personal representative at the London Economic Conference of 1933, conduct the first face-to-face negotiations with Maxim Litvinov-Finkelstein, who was present in London as Stalin's emissary. Upon his return, Hull put on paper a long memorandum stating that the American State Department was unanimously in favor of diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union, giving the appearance that FDR was merely following the advice of professional American diplomats on the road to Moscow.

On October 10, 1933, FDR wrote a letter to Kalinin, President of the Central Committee of the CPSU. Kalinin was an uneducated peasant and Stalin's servile puppet. Together with Stalin himself, Kalinin was the only member of Lenin's Politburo who had not yet been liquidated in 1939. FDR demanded that Moscow send a plenipotentiary to Washington/D. C. for the so-called normalization of relations between the USA and the USSR. Roosevelt knew in advance that Stalin would send the Soviet foreign commissioner Litvinov, which was confirmed in a letter from Kalinin to FDR dated October 17, 1933. After intensive discussions between FDR and Litvinov on every conceivable world problem, diplomatic relations between Roosevelt and Stalin-led Bolshevism were confirmed with a public exchange of letters on November 16, 1933.

Stalin was pleased that FDR sent as his first ambassador to the Soviet Union, William C. Bullitt. Bullitt had rendered many services to Lenin and Stalin during the 1917-1920 Civil War against the Russian Christians, and he had been considered a sure Bolshevik sympathizer for more than twenty years. Bullitt hurried to Moscow. In an extended conversation on December 20, 1933, Stalin

expressed his pleasure that the USSR and the United States had become de facto allies, and he expressed confidence to Bullitt that the world would one day realize that this was an arrangement that would last. Stalin assured Bullitt that he had always kept the rest of Moscow's foreign diplomatic corps at arm's length and was virtually unavailable to most of them; but he, Bullitt, as the emissary of his chief ally Roosevelt, would be received "day and night "67. With a mischievous twinkle in his eye, Stalin assured Bullitt that "President Roosevelt is one of the most popular men in the USSR today, although he is the leader of a capitalist nation "68^

An alliance that was to last until FDR's death, and which made his mother Sara particularly happy, was signed and sealed on the occasion of this Stalin-Bullitt chat on December 20, 1933. Less than twelve years passed before the evil triumvirate of Stalin-Roosevelt-Churchill destroyed Hitler's new Third Reich and with it much happiness and joy in a rejuvenated Europe. Churchill had indeed been temporarily forced out of office by Halifax in 1931 because the latter would not tolerate Churchill's public disparaging criticism of the skillful and successful policy with which Halifax had deceived the Mahatma Gandhi about the chances that the English *Raj* (Lord) would one day give India freedom but, by unleashing the Second World War in 1939, the same Halifax facilitated the return of England's leading warmonger to office as Parliamentary First Lord of the Admiralty-a post from which Churchill had been driven with disgrace by First Sea Lord Fisher in 1915.

The third in the group: Winston Churchill

Thanks to Bernard Baruch, who personally traveled to London in 1933 to inform his friend Churchill that the FDR-Stalin personal alliance was being negotiated behind the backs of the American people.

(which naively assumed that Roosevelt was merely establishing normal diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, as were maintained by the other major powers), Churchill himself was well aware of the final conclusion of the permanent FDR-Stalin alliance.

In addition to his journalistic work, Churchill continued to be a Tory Member of Parliament. With the formation of the English Emergency Coalition of 1931, Ramsay MacDonald, the leader of the British Labour Party (which had replaced the Liberals as one of the two recognized parliamentary parties), had handed over de facto control of England's destiny in the 1930s to Stanley Baldwin, the Tory leader, who was an old personal friend of Churchill. England was to have

only one general election during the long fourteen years 1931-1945, that of 1935, in which Baldwin concealed British Foreign Secretary Hoare's involvement in preparing the dismemberment of Abyssinia. Baldwin and Hoare lied to the British electorate, which had supported the principle of collective security under the League of Nations in the 1934 Robert Cecil peace referendum, by flaunting a belief in the League of Nations that Baldwin did not in fact harbor for a moment. Baldwin managed to muster a huge Tory majority with election statements that remained untested until the overwhelming Labour victory and the sacking of Churchill as England's World War II dictator even before the defeat of Japan, but after the defeat of Germany in 1945.

As soon as Churchill realized in 1932 that FDR would inevitably move into the White House the next year, he launched an infamous public smear campaign against Germany at Baruch's behest - at a time when Franz von Papen, not Adolf Hitler, was Reich Chancellor. Churchill's worst lies concerned an invented German massive rearmament. The only area in this Churchillian world of lies that had a semblance of veracity concerned the moderate secret military cooperation between the Weimar Republic and the Soviet Union that had once been begun in 1922 by Walther Rathenau, the Weimar Republic's foreign minister, at Rapallo; but Stalin unilaterally ended this policy in 1933, before entering into his personal alliance with FDR, and against Hitler's wishes to continue it.

Of course, Churchill was not Baruch's only political ally in England. There was also the Jewish Tory leader Leslie Hore-Belisha, who regarded himself as a second Disraeli.⁶⁹ In addition to Churchill and Hore-Belisha, there were also many other Tory troublemakers such as Leopold Amery, Alfred Duff-Cooper, Anthony Eden, Duncan Sandys and Harold Macmillan. Crucially - and Stalin was fully aware of this through Bullitt - Churchill was Baruch's favorite. This gave Churchill particular influence and enabled him, during the period when Halifax kept him out of public office, to maintain his proud status as the leading political lobbyist in England and the most famous and bloodthirsty English warmonger since Cromwell's death in 1658.⁷⁰

Thus Stalin had only been Soviet *vozhd* (leader) for four years - since 1929 - FDR in America had been in the White House for less than a year, and Churchill, the main British warmonger, had been removed from office by Halifax since 1931; but in November 1933 a secret meeting of the British Empire Defense Council solemnly decided to use the bombing of helpless German civilians in the forthcoming Second World War instead of the starvation blockade of 1914, because Germany had become wiser about blockade and would hardly be so vulnerable in this respect.⁷¹

The decisive step that made a second British imperialist aggression against Germany possible only twenty-one years after the German defeat in the First

World War was the conclusion in 1933 of the permanent alliance between Frank Roosevelt and Josef Stalin, the leaders of the two states that had by then become the most ruthless, aggressive and powerful in the world. Both far surpassed and overshadowed the decadent and decaying old British Empire^{72^}

FDR and Stalin used the services of the old and dying empire for their own imperialist game. Although FDR had learned in Paris in 1919 how to bamboozle the arrogant, pathological and bumbling warmonger Churchill, from the outset he wanted to share dominion over the entire globe not with Churchill but - in accordance with his mother's wishes - with Stalin^{73^}

An American-Soviet conspiracy

FDR's domestic "New Deal" program was a costly and total failure and had to be scrapped almost entirely after the defeat of France in 1940. Along with the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941 and the successful sabotage of Hitler's war operations against the Soviet Union by the German treasonous elite that same year, the defeat of France in 1940 was the third fortunate event in FDR's long political career. It made it possible for him in June 1940 to begin putting the United States on a permanent war footing. In keeping with Roosevelt's fervent desire, the U.S. has remained constantly ready for war since June 1940 - with military budget expenditures 1000 percent higher than during the 1930s.

FDR had failed to make peacetime conscription palatable to the US population during the 1920s, but in 1940, thanks to the defeat of France, he solved this problem by using appeasement propaganda to persuade the US Congress to pass it by a narrow majority. Although formal peacetime conscription was temporarily abandoned by the US after its defeat in Vietnam in 1974-1975, military spending continued to increase instead of decreasing. The volunteer recruitment policy remained a temporary experiment, and American plans for total mobilization and conscription - including the enlistment of American women - were improved and modernized. The whole European show was a cynical cat-and-mouse game from December 20, 1933 to May 23, 1933. December 1933 until May 23, 1945, when the Allies arrested the last legal German Reich government.

Stalin's regret after 1917 that Lenin's plan to conquer all of Germany for Bolshevism had failed was matched by Roosevelt's regret in Paris in 1919 that Germany had not been effectively and permanently dismembered. FDR was such a chauvinist and so full of hatred for the Germans that he threatened to see to the dismissal of an American occupation general in Koblenz who hesitated to fly the German national colors and hoist the flag of the United States on the traditional German national monument Ehrenbreitstein in 1919^{74^}

A modus vivendi was reached in the Washington talks of November 1933 and the Moscow talks of December 1933 between Stalin and FDR and their representatives: half of Germany was to fall to the Soviet Union forever after the next war, the other half to remain dismembered under permanent American occupation and control. Thanks to the helpful plans and propaganda of Henry Morgenthau Jr. and the blindness of the British Tory imperialists - together with the indispensable pro-Rooseveltian and pro-Stalinian sabotage and espionage of the old German secret treason elite - these nefarious goals were achieved. West German secondary school teachers after 1949 were encouraged to describe the permanent division of Germany in class as being in the interests of Europe, because a free and united Germany - like Wilhelm II's or Hitler's - would have unhealthily exorbitant power compared to other less fortunate European countries⁷⁵.

The fact that such nonsense could be foisted on the disillusioned German people decade after decade after 1945 is the best proof of the total permanent enslavement of the entire German people, for which FDR and Stalin conspired together and successfully from 1933 onwards. It was a successful conspiracy, one might add, which has since then always excited and inspired world Jewry, both Bolshevik and Zionist. It goes without saying that this triumph of Roosevelt and Stalin in 1945 shattered the whole of Europe, at least temporarily, and destroyed its natural role as the center of culture and power of all Western civilization, thus fulfilling the worst prophecies of Oswald Spengler from the period between 1918 and the death of the great master of history in 1936⁷⁶.

Stalin's flattery of a shallow egotist like FDR was both clever and effective⁷⁷. The *Vozhd* learned this firsthand after the return from the US of his field commissioner Litvinov, a Polish Jew born in Bialystok who had sold ladies' corsets in London before becoming a professional Bolshevik and devoted creature of Stalin. Bullitt told me in 1947 that on a Paris-Moscow railroad journey in 1936, when they reached Bialystok, the ardent Jew announced that they were passing Litvinov's home town. When Bullitt remarked that he had not known that Litvinov was Polish, the latter replied quite seriously that he was *not*, and added that the city of Bialystok would not remain a Polish city for much longer. When, at the beginning of 1939, both the League of Nations ploy of "collective security" and Litvinov himself fell out of favor with Stalin, the latter replaced Litvinov with Molotov, who, although not a Jew himself, was, like Stalin, married to a fanatically Bolshevik Jewish woman. When Stalin occupied and annexed eastern Poland a few months later, he actually incorporated Bialystok into the Soviet Union along with eighty thousand square miles of Polish territory. Curiously, in 1945, when Stalin and his Lublin Committee of Bolshevik Poles and Jews took over all of Poland, he detached the Bialystok territory from the Soviet Union and annexed it to the Stalinist Polish state - thus

confirming in 1945 that Litvinov, despite his claims to the contrary, was a Polish Jew after all.

The "Good Neighbor" of the Latin American countries

Another potentially important feature of FDR's 1933 foreign policy was his continuation of Herbert Hoover's so-called "Good Neighbor" policy, which the former president had initiated on an extended trip through South America in 1929. Hoover's concept was that some of the crudeness and abrasiveness of American economic and political imperialism in Latin America could be reduced - though not eliminated - if U.S. leaders showed more interest and zeal for the region in the form of state visits, cultural exchange missions and the like. Roosevelt seized on Hoover's policy of innovation as a means of strengthening American political, economic and military control over the entire Western Hemisphere. As FDR saw it, the more you took care of the Latin Americans, the better you got a grip on them. FDR carefully left intact the 1904 Teddy Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, which Hoover would have liked to abolish and which unilaterally proclaimed an alleged U.S. privilege to deploy armed forces into the territory of any of the twenty Latin American states whenever the President and Commander-in-Chief of the United States decided to do so. FDR dearly loved his cousin's display of superior Yankee power that rendered all of Latin America forever helpless against the encroachments of imperialist Yankee exploiters, and he had no intention of giving any of it up.

He also went further than Teddy in appointing himself spokesman for the twenty Latin American countries without being authorized to do so by them, especially when he made unsolicited statements on foreign policy that were hostile and disparaging to Europe.⁷⁸ Roosevelt had decided in 1933 to join Stalin in setting Europe and Asia on fire, and he realized how useful it was in this context to seize the rich natural resources of Latin America. Although England had been the main foreign investor in the region between the Peace of Utrecht in 1713 and Grey's unleashing of the First World War in 1914, the British had had to draw heavily on their Latin American investments financially during the course of the First World War and liquidated many of them, enabling the USA to replace England as the number one foreign investor in Latin America in 1918.

FDR was not unduly alarmed when eighty percent of Americans in a 1937 poll declared that "the entry of the United States into the war in 1917 was a disastrous mistake."⁷⁹ He knew from Baruch and Wilson and from his study of English history that it was relatively easy to involve oppressed and ignorant masses in foreign wars they did not desire. In this respect, FDR had no more regard for American public opinion than Lenin and Stalin had for Russian public

opinion when they starved and plundered the Russian masses while enjoying every conceivable luxury themselves. After all, FDR himself was one of the usual American plutocratic miscreants, for whom it would have been unthinkable to recognize any of LaFollette's virtues, such as integrity, honesty, decency, and a desire to improve the lot and conditions of the oppressed American masses in a genuine - and not merely feigned - way. One day he remarked to his pro-Stalin Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes⁸⁰ : With a mere ten million dollars, which he could personally raise at any time if necessary, he could block any amendment to the Constitution, whether it came from the Progressives or elsewhere, aimed at improving or making more progressive the politically reactionary US Constitution, which had come into force in 1789 and had seen very scant improvements over the six generations since.

It was this kind of cynicism-typical of all American plutocratic evildoers since Astor, but especially evident in Baruch, J. D. Rockefeller, Jr. and H. Morgenthau, Jr.-that made FDR's enduring and intense collaboration with his secret ally from 1933 on, Josef Stalin, both easy and natural.

So while driving through the streets of Rio de Janeiro in 1937 with General Getulio Vargas - the Brazilian dictator with whom FDR had just concluded a US-Brazilian alliance that lasted for forty years until it was abandoned by President Jimmy Carter in 1977 - Vargas asserted on that occasion that, despite his official title, he was no ordinary parliamentary president, but an all-powerful dictator. FDR, not at all disgruntled, wittily replied that all his critics at home accused him of seeking the same position in perpetuity in his country-a statement that contributed in no small measure to Vargas' opinion after 1937 that, despite the hitherto sacrosanct American tradition of Washington and Jefferson that no US president should or could serve more than two four-year terms, Roosevelt would never voluntarily vacate the White House again. Both Vargas and FDR remained in power until 1945⁸¹

Roosevelt's four dictatorial terms in office

By then, Roosevelt - despite the legendary wisdom of the so-called founding fathers of the USA, which he personally never took seriously - had been elected four times to four consecutive four-year terms as president. In terms of ruthless single-mindedness, delight in the human suffering of others, and contempt and disregard for all historical tradition, FDR and Stalin certainly had much in common, and the fact that both were much tougher than Churchill explains the pleasure both took - alone or when the Big Three were *together* - in tormenting and mocking the pompous English Tory. No wonder, in these circumstances, that

Germany suffered more atrocities in 1945 than any other nation in history - an outcome that could easily have been predicted in the event of Germany's military defeat in the Second World War and which the old German betrayal elite would not have ignored had they not been motivated by selfish egotism but shared Hitler's völkisch world view.

The so-called Neutrality Acts of the United States, enacted between 1935 and 1937, made no more impression on FDR than the results of the polls. After all, these laws - whatever they contained - were passed by the same corrupt US Congress that FDR proved on many occasions could be easily circumvented, and Duroselle was undoubtedly correct in asserting that this legislation was flawed in every case, by stipulating that in wartime there should be an embargo only on unquestionably military goods, such as munitions, and not a total embargo like Jefferson's of 1807, which applied to American foreign trade of all kinds with the European belligerents.

Successfully tackling his personal detractors in the US Congress was, in FDR's opinion, no more difficult than Stalin's elimination of the Trotskyists of the Fourth International in the Soviet Union by 1937-an achievement capped by the brutal, Stalin-arranged assassination of the heavily-guarded Leon Trotsky in Mexico in 1940. Trotsky's brain was broken with an ice pick - a remarkable tactic given the care with which Lenin's brain had been removed from his embalmed body and pickled separately in the Soviet Union. FDR knew-and Stalin openly admitted it-that at the time of Lenin's death, in 1924, the ardent Jewish Soviet leader and hero of the Russian Civil War, Leon Bronstein Trotsky, was infinitely better known and more popular among Soviet Bolsheviks than Stalin himself, who had usually remained in the background during Lenin's lifetime. This did not prevent the resourceful Stalin from successfully playing cat-and-mouse with Trotsky as soon as Lenin was dead-and FDR, knowing that he was more ruthless and skillful than his American political opponents, did not care in the least that they had public opinion on their side. He was convinced-like Stalin-that he could defeat them either way, and his dreams came true on December 7, 1941.

During the eight years from 1933 to 1941, when the full scope of their conspiracy unfolded, there were many occasions when the two ambitious criminal partners, Roosevelt and Stalin, flew into fits of rage. This was the case with Stalin, for example, when his friend Kirov was assassinated in Leningrad on December 1, 1934, and again when the anti-Trotsky, anti-Stalin Bolshevik leader Bukharin testified in March 1938 during the seemingly endless Moscow mammoth treason trial.

Frank Roosevelt flew into a rage when on May 8, 1935, US Admiral Sims publicly mocked the absurd naval-military theories of the late Captain Alfred Mahan, a man whom FDR revered and whose memory he cherished to the end. Another example occurred on April 28, 1939, when he listened to Hitler's magnificent Reichstag speech and its translation. Hitler's speech echoed all the errors and historical inaccuracies contained in FDR's provocative and insulting public message to Hitler and Mussolini on April 15, 1939. Roosevelt in his senseless rage clenched his fists until they were all red⁸³^

Although Hitler temporarily abandoned his efforts to appease Stalin for six years from 1933 onwards due to Stalin's unilateral revocation of the Soviet-German friendship pact of 1926 - until Stalin's suddenly conciliatory and pro-German public speech on March 10, 1939 (a strategic maneuver that Stalin hoped would cause difficulties with Britain and France after the Soviet-American-Churchill attempt to sabotage the Munich summit) - Hitler's efforts to appease Stalin were not successful. March 1939 (a strategic maneuver that Stalin hoped would put Germany in trouble with Britain and France after the Soviet-American-Churchill attempt to sabotage the 1938 Munich Conference on peaceful Versailles revision had failed) - but Hitler never let up in his efforts until Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt in every conceivable way, and this is also the reason why the Jewish historian Saul Friedlaender⁸⁴ gives Hitler the grade "very good" for his conduct of German foreign policy towards the USA from the day of his appointment on January 30, 1933, until his Reichstag appointment. Hitler inevitably ended up on the side of Japan after the US government announced on December 8, 1941 that a state of war between the USA and Germany had become unavoidable due to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor the previous day. Japan, Germany's ally for defense purposes since 1940, had thus taken a stand against unlawful American acts of war and aggression that followed FDR's war-like blockade of the Japanese Empire on July 13, 1941. July 1941, which had its sole basis in the Vichy-France-Japan Friendship and Security Treaty of June 23, 1941 - one day after Hitler responded with a declaration of war to FDR's principal ally Stalin's unlawful and aggressive acts against Germany from 1940-1941. Hitler's reticence toward Roosevelt reflected his genuine pro-American stance and was all the more remarkable given the barrage of personal insults against himself fired in public tirades by Roosevelt, Hull, Ickes, LaGuardia, Hopkins, Wallace, Untermyer, Frankfurter, Morgenthau, and a bevy of other New Deal representatives⁸⁵. The same impartiality was displayed by Mussolini, who was viciously criticized in public by Fiorello LaGuardia, the Italian Jew and FDR acolyte. With veritable oceans of irresponsible

Mussolini was slandered by the American media during the Italo-Abyssinian War of 1935-1936 - the war that began when British Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs Vansittart unwittingly torpedoed Anglo-French efforts through an indiscretion at a Paris cocktail party, Italy in Abyssinia (where in 1934 the Ethiopians were guilty of blatant military aggression against the Italians at Wal-Wal in Italian Somaliland, which bordered French Somaliland and British Somaliland).

Roosevelt threatens the Axis powers

Despite all this habitual American propagandistic mistreatment of Italy and many other foreign countries - a practice that has not changed to this day - the Duce generously declared in an interview with the Chicago Tribune on January 19, 1937, that FDR "is what I would call a social dictator. He combines in his hand as much power as is possible under your system with the intention of bringing about social justice."⁸⁶ No doubt the Duce also had considerations of diplomatic strategy in mind, but his praise was extraordinarily kind and even exaggerated when measured against what FDR actually deserved.

Duroselle is understandably fascinated by Roosevelt's sudden change of heart in his Chicago speech of October 5, 1937, his switch from a feigned peace policy and impartiality in foreign affairs to a noisy crusade to destroy the freedom and national independence of Germany, Italy and Japan in a hoped-for diplomatic alliance with Stalin and the British. These were nations of which FDR himself stated in his speech that they represented fully ten percent of the world's population, and which possessed perhaps fifty percent of all the ability and talent in the world in terms of technological, scientific and cultural achievements.

Roosevelt took his drastic step in Chicago in 1937 with Stalin's confidential blessings. He had recalled Bullitt from Moscow in 1936 when he had doubts about Stalin's atrocities and brutality. But because Bullitt had only criticized certain details and had not yet rebelled against the idea of the permanent FDR-Stalin alliance, and was at that point still willing to help Roosevelt in the final destruction of Germany, Italy and Japan, FDR merely moved him to Paris instead of dropping him altogether, as he did in 1940 with Joseph Kennedy in London, who rebelled when Roosevelt refused to consider Hitler's reasonable offers for a European peace after the defeat of France. Roosevelt chose the hot-tempered Jewish plutocrat Joseph Davies of Chicago to take over the Moscow post, knowing that Davies was personally no less fanatically devoted to Stalin than himself and would never utter a word of criticism of Stalin, of whom Robert Conquest⁸⁷, the best English expert on Stalin's crimes, estimated that he

destroyed the lives of 45 million Soviet citizens during his time as Vozhd 1929-1953, not counting the many killed by Stalin during the Russian Civil War 1917-1920 and during the struggle for power with Trotsky (1924-1929). Davies' pro-Communist mendacity and fanaticism are fully revealed in his "Mission in Moscow".

Roosevelt would not have taken his drastic public step of 1937 - outlawing Germany, Italy and Japan and predicting that the US would not stay out of any future war - had he not been convinced that he could achieve his ultimate goal. Otherwise his speech would only have involved him in a pointless polemic. What Polish Ambassador Graf Potock reported to his State Department in early 1939: that the U.S. public media was one hundred percent in Jewish hands was perfectly known to FDR, and he hoped that five years of terrible lies about Germany, Italy and Japan had begun to soften the American mind - at least subconsciously - even though in 1937 eighty percent of Americans still condemned Wilson's pathological military aggression against Germany twenty years earlier. Roosevelt, who had utterly failed in the face of the US economic crisis and had for years advocated dividing and enslaving the world between the US and the USSR, as House, Baruch and Wilson had earlier envisioned, this FDR thus had no fixed timetable that would have required a new world war within a fixed number of weeks or months. He was impatient for war, excited by the prospect of senseless bloodshed, but he was not yet so politically cornered (even if Grenville Clark had foiled his plan to fill the Supreme Court with his creatures) that he had to have the war immediately or else leave the White House.

Roosevelt's America on the eve of war

The Republican Party remained in utter disarray after its overwhelming defeat in the 1936 presidential election. FDR managed to capture all but two states after his chief critic within his own party, Senator Huey Long of Louisiana, was assassinated in 1935 (by Dr. Weiss, a Jewish terrorist who had received special training in Europe). The recent American recession of 1937 showed that no progress had been made in reducing unemployment. Nearly 60 million people - the 15 million unemployed and their families - received meager public assistance. 55 dollars a month was considered reasonable for a family of five. With a US population of 130 million at the time, 45 percent of all Americans were living on assistance - after five years of Rooseveltian domestic policy. FDR had run up the national debt by 45 billion dollars during this period in a futile attempt to stimulate the American economy, which was drowning in a flood of bureaucratic regulations. The new economic setback of 1937 proved

that the whole New Deal policy was fundamentally flawed and the US would remain increasingly bankrupt in the mire of its depression for at least another generation, unless someone started another global war in which the US was actively involved. Despite all this, FDR could be sure that effective opposition to his dictatorial rule - whether decent or impure - would be slow to emerge: Progressivism was forever dead and American public life more hopelessly corrupt than ever before in the history of this or any other country, with the brilliant Democratic rival Huey Long eliminated and the Republican opposition split into two incompetent and ineffectual factions under Alf Landon and Herbert Hoover.

One has every reason to believe that - even if Halifax had not unleashed World War II in 1939 - Roosevelt would have stolen a third term in 1940 on the grounds that he was indispensable in the face of the national economic emergency that had continued unabated since 1929 and for which Herbert Hoover was still falsely blamed. Roosevelt would have been extremely happy if World War II had broken out in Europe or Asia the day after his incendiary, pathological and bellicose speech in Chicago on October 5, 1937, but the fact remains that his political survival did not necessarily depend on the outbreak of such a war - the lying, clever Jewish propaganda was firmly behind him, the most popular US president in American history. None of the Rooseveltian epigones who followed him ever came close to this unique popularity.

The old claim that FDR encouraged the outbreak of World War II to save his own political career is too generous given his real motives and is untrue. The fact is that Roosevelt did not need World War II for his political survival, that the war as such was valuable and desirable to him, and that he saw that very war as the fulfillment of his lifelong secret and hidden hopes and dreams⁸⁹.

Chapter seven

GENIUS AGAINST MEANINGFULNESS (Ezra Pound and Frank Roosevelt)

The poet and the dictator

The unsurpassable infamy of FDR and Stalin to divide the world in secret alliance appeared on the world stage as the greatest crisis mankind has ever faced, the moment Roosevelt dropped the mask in Chicago on October 5, 1937 and openly emerged as a budding global aggressor. One should not imagine that contemporaries would have recognized this any less clearly than they do today, more than forty years later.

To this observation it can be added that no person alive today saw this with greater clarity back in 1937 than the late Ezra Pound (1885-1972). This fact should come as no surprise, for Pound - whom Eisenhower's Secretary of State Herter characterized as "that difficult man" - was not only of solicitous kindness, considerate, decent and brave; he was also America's foremost intellectual, one of its finest creative artists and patrons of the arts, and a political, economic and social philosopher of the first rank. All of these indisputable facts have long been documented by a vast body of scholarly literature

Pound is to the USA - and always will be - what Fyedor Dostoyevsky (1821-1888) is to Russia, Johann Wolfgang Goethe (1749-1832) to Germany, William Shakespeare (1564-1616) to England, Robert Burns (1759-1796) to Scotland, Verner von Heidenstam (1859-1940) to Sweden, Knut Hamsun (1859-1951) to Norway, Calderon de la Barca (1600-1681) to Spain and Henri

Beyle Stendhal (1783-1842) for France. In short, Pound is a kind of eternal living national monument in the best form of the heroic intellectual genius in

the manner of Plato (427-347 B.C.) and Tacitus (50-116) in ancient Greece and Rome-the highest existing form of man. From 1937 to 1945, Pound fought FDR alone in the only way a uniquely creative genius can fight: He fought with decency, nobility, tenacity, selfless devotion to the highest ideals of humanity, and with the magnificent obsession and single-mindedness that only true genius can understand. His sole aim was to prevent Roosevelt and Stalin from dividing up the world and destroying Europe, Asia and America spiritually and materially in the process. He failed, of course - a reason for the shallow American pragmatists to condemn him.

A decent, hopeless fight

Surely it should not be necessary to explain at length why no Christian can join in the condemnation of any cause solely on the basis of its earthly failure. Quite apart from the fact that Pound had to flee Rome unaided from the advancing Allies and nearly lost his life in the final stages of the Second World War, his eight-year genuinely Christian crusade led him to senseless persecution and thirteen years of horrific incarceration under the thumb of illiterate American penal sadists, none of whom had the slightest idea who they were persecuting and abusing. Countless times during these thirteen years Pound came within a hair's breadth of being murdered or executed. During one period of his imprisonment in the notorious military prison in Pisa, Italy, he, who was demonstrably in poor health and over sixty years old, was left outside day and night in the cold and wet winter weather, wearing only a worn, wet-soaked child's shawl to protect him from the merciless weather. Serenity and dignity characterized Pound's mention of this one typical aspect of his endless imprisonment in his "Pisan Cantos" 3.

The Australian writer Noel Stock, who like Pound was well versed in economic, political and social theory, wrote four book-length studies on various aspects of Pound's work and career. At the suggestion of the venerable Pound scholar Hugh Kenner, Stock began writing on Pound in 1953 during his imprisonment in Washington, DC. C., and the correspondence between the two continued for almost twenty years. And lest one think that the intellectually incessantly vigorous and active Pound only had the time to write a few careless letters to Stock: During the last five years of his imprisonment - until his eventual escape from the USA back to Europe in 1958 - Pound wrote over one hundred long letters to Stock.

For Pound's sake, Stock founded his own libertarian literary magazine *Edge* in 1956 and joined the editorial board of the Australian daily newspaper *The New Times*⁴ He also visited Pound's relatives in South Tyrol in 1958 and met

Pound for the first time in Rapallo, Italy (where Pound had lived from 1924 to 1945) in 1959 and assisted Pound in editing some of his essays for a book entitled "Impact", which was published in New York the following year. Pound's wife Dorothy asked Stock in 1966 - without Pound's knowledge - to write the definitive Pound biography⁵

The genius from Idaho

Pound was born on October 30, 1885, in that part of Oregon that was not part of the state of Oregon when it was admitted to the Union by the US Congress in 1859. This part of Oregon, where Pound was born, became its own state of Idaho in 1890. His father was the director of a federal settlement office in charge of distributing the state's land. But when Pound's mother became seriously ill and needed specialized medical care that was unavailable in a region of fur trappers, miners, scattered Christian missions and Indian medicine men, the family moved to New York in 1887. As a result of his mother's illness, Ezra remained the only child.

After deciding to become a professional poet in 1900, Pound went to the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia in 1901, where his initial majors were Latin and German literature, with a minor in American history⁶ Pound had visited Europe as a young child with his father and returned there in the summer of 1902 as a more mature young observer. Returning to the University of Pennsylvania that fall for his sophomore year, he focused fully on political theory, political science, economics, and history and forged a close and lasting professional relationship with another future American poet: William Carlos Williams⁷.

After completing two years of study at the large state university in Philadelphia, Pound went to the select private Hamilton College near Utica, New York, in 1903 for two more years of study, where he earned his Bachelor of Arts degree, focused on medieval and Renaissance Italian literature, and developed most of the ideas that later appeared in his popular, successful book of literary criticism, "The Spirit of Romance. Pound returned to the University of Pennsylvania for the 1905-1906 academic year to earn his Master of Arts (M. A.), which was required at the time if one wished to enter the field of college or university teaching⁹. His main areas of study since earning his Bachelor of Arts at Hamilton College have been Old French, Provençal, Italian and Spanish literature.

Because of his outstanding academic achievements, Pound was awarded the prestigious annual Pennsylvania Harrison Fellowship in Romance Languages and Literatures shortly before his twenty-first birthday, which came with a

generous stipend that enabled him to travel to Europe in the summer of 1906¹⁰. Pound conducted research at the British Museum in London for his planned habilitation thesis on newly discovered aspects of the work of the great Spanish Baroque dramatist and veteran of the Armada attack on England in 1588, Lope de Vega (1562-1635). He also worked on Vega at the Sorbonne in Paris and in Madrid, where he worked in the collection of Lope de Vega manuscripts in the Royal Spanish Library. During his stay, he formed a lasting and mutually enriching friendship with Jose Echege- ray, who had been awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1904. Pound also witnessed an unsuccessful anarcho-syndicalist attempt on the lives of King Alfonso and the Queen of Spain¹¹.

Immediately after his return to the USA in the fall of 1906, Pound published a series of brilliant articles on Romance and Spanish literature in leading American academic journals. Particularly noteworthy in these early works was Pound's emphatically Christian stance¹².

Pound accepted a teaching position at the Presbyterian Wabash College in Crawfordsville, Indiana, in August 1907, where he was appointed chairman of the department of French, Spanish and Italian literature and - although he was only twenty-one years old - was offered a full professorship within two years. (Friedrich Nietzsche was twenty-three when he was offered a professorship at the University of Basel in 1868). Like Princeton, the private Presbyterian university in New Jersey (which gave Woodrow Wilson his academic nemesis), Wabash, founded in 1832, had a trace of a Southern atmosphere, for many of its students were Presbyterians from the American South. As a selective institution of higher learning, Wabash ranked well above the U.S. average, but it lacked the research facilities Pound expected, and - its air of the American South notwithstanding - it was located in the provincial Midwest.
the USA.

Pound soon shared the horror that had once befallen Horace Mann, the founder of American public education, who late in his career had left Boston, Massachusetts, to assume the presidency of Antioch College in Ohio, where he died a few years later in 1859. In the last years before his death, Mann declared that the souls of all the petty people of Ohio could be collected and placed on the point of a needle. Pound found the growing opposition to him in Wabash almost a little reassuring - from the president, the Rev. Mackintosh, on down. Woody Wilson was the first Presbyterian layman to serve as president of Princeton in 1902. All of his predecessors - like those at Wabash - had been Presbyterian clergymen. Pound would have been shocked if he had been popular with the narrow-minded people of Indiana¹³.

He decided to leave Wabash after one semester of teaching (September 1907 to January 1908). He left New York City on February 8, 1908, on his fourth trip to Europe. Although Pound spent more of his life in Europe than in America from 1908 onward, it should not be mistakenly inferred that he was not a conservative and Christian American nationalist, which in fact he remained throughout his life. Pound resembled only John Copley, a brilliant portraitist and landscape painter and outstanding artist of George Washington's generation. Copley spent most of his life in Europe, but rejoiced in the American-French victory at Yorktown (1781) over the English as much as any other American nationalist, which, like Pound six generations later, he had always remained.

It was simply that artistic geniuses like Copley and Pound needed the kind of cultural environment that European artists like Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart in Copley's day and Romain Rolland in Pound's time had, but they could not get from America what had never existed there before, namely a genuine American cultural environment¹⁵.

Pound's first European base in 1908 was Gibraltar, from where he visited Granada and Morocco. He then settled in Venice for three months. In this region, he particularly enjoyed the magnificent Verona on the Adige. His third base was Paris, where his financial resources ran out. When he arrived in London towards the end of the year, he only had fifteen dollars left. So he immediately drew his pension from 1906 because he was sure he could get credit there.

A genius like Pound never had to worry about money for long, as far as his own modest material needs were concerned. Rather, he spent his life worrying about the material well-being of other great artists who were less adept at making money than he was. None of the world's richest philanthropists gave as much help at the right time to deserving artists as Ezra Pound. A genius like Richard Wagner (1813-1883), who, despite the notorious thriftiness of his first wife, was constantly without money until he landed on the royal Wittelsbach payroll late in life - in circumstances that can only be described as humiliating¹⁷ - would have loved Pound. In 1908, Pound was immediately offered a position as an art teacher at the London Polytechnic Institute in Regent Street. And very soon after his arrival in London, the Fleet Street magazines printed him on top of everything else, and they rushed to admit him as a member of the London Poets' Club and the London United Arts Club.

Pound began publishing his own work in the prestigious English Review in June 1909, just a few months after his arrival from Paris. He received good royalties of twenty percent of the gross price of the books he published in London, and maintained good and close professional relations with G. B. Shaw and W. B. Yeats, as well as James Joyce, the most brilliant Irish artist of his

generation, and D. H. Lawrence, the outstanding English novelist who had married the sister of Manfred von Richtenshof. H. Lawrence, the outstanding English novelist who married Manfred von Richthofen's sister and became the recognized greatest English writer since Thomas Hardy's death. Pound gave up his position at the Polytechnic Institute in 1909 in favor of a more prestigious one at the Croydon Davidson Read School of Art, where he taught from 1909 to 1912

Pound spent a lot of time in France and Italy in 1910, where he set up a base on Lake Garda not far from Brescia, and from where he also visited Austria. At this time, Yeats had given Pound the label "lonely volcano" ¹⁹ with a sharp eye. Pound returned to the United States in the summer of 1910 to do some translations from Italian at the elite Swarthmore College in Philadelphia, to arrange some American editions of his books published in London, and to deflect in reading favorable reviews of his own work in the prestigious Evening Transcript, the sophisticated favorite newspaper of the Harvard elite, mocked in the poems of Pound's friend, the later English poet laureate T. S. Eliot. (In his "Cantos" Pound always used the code name "Opossum" for Eliot).

Italy's literary genius Caralcanti was unknown in America until Pound initiated the publication of his own translations of Cavalcanti's sonnets and ballads during his visit to the USA in 1910²⁰. Pound celebrated this visit to the USA after his return to Europe with his first book about the USA²¹. His next visit to the American homeland took place twenty-nine years later in 1939, and the purpose of this trip was solely political, not artistic: Pound wanted to participate in the struggle of American Christians and nationalists against FDR's pathological, Jewish-inspired intent to join Stalin in setting the world on fire²².

Pound spent a large part of 1911 in Germany doing research work in Freiburg im Breisgau, Frankfurt am Main and especially in Giessen²³. He had immersed himself in the study of the languages, art and literature of India. After the end of his teaching career in Croydon, he was a guest lecturer at the University of Oxford/England in 1913. In March 1913, he launched the London Poetry Magazine, the most creative English literary magazine of the 20th century. In the first issue, he introduced the world to the work of the American poet Robert Frost from New England, who later became President Kennedy's favorite poet. Then, after having another of his books published in London²⁴, Pound went to Paris, where he worked professionally on a plethora of important projects with Jules Romains, France's greatest novelist of the 20th century²⁵. Afterwards, Pound traveled to Munich on a successful search for new German talent for his Poetry Magazine.

Pound spent three months between 1913 and 1914 in Sussex, England, where he worked with W. B. Yeats on important imagist and symbolist literary projects. Here Pound learned from Yeats that the Irish literary genius James Joyce was living in extreme poverty in Trieste in Austria-Hungary. The English censors had banned the publication of Joyce's great book "Dubliners" for England and Ireland for ten years because Joyce refused to expunge remarks he had overheard in a Dublin pub referring to the popular British King Edward VII, who was a satyr sexually and constantly in the company of debauched French prostitutes. Joyce had to wait for Irish independence for his book to be published. Having made sure that Joyce was literally starving to death - as Mozart once was - and unable to help himself, Pound undertook a one-man financial crusade on behalf of the unknown and unloved Joyce and his ailing wife. Without this, Joyce would have died as a promising author of a single book. The result of Pound's selfless philanthropy - he alone supported Joyce for years - was James Joyce's universally acclaimed, classic works of literature, such as "Ulysses" and "Finnegans Wake" ²⁶.

The decision of Mary Fenollosa, the widow of the great Ernest Fenollosa, to entrust Pound with her husband's entire literary legacy in 1913 was fateful for Pound ²⁷. Fenollosa, who had taught at Harvard and the Imperial University in Tokyo, had become the most important connoisseur and critic of classical Chinese and Japanese literature. Pound, who possessed an uncanny musical and linguistic ability, immediately threw himself into an intensive study of the languages of the East in order to become worthy of the custodianship of the Fenollosa legacy. Finally, Pound himself produced excellent translations of Kung (Confucius) and other Eastern classics. The Chinese curators of the Hoover Institution assert that Pound's translations, extensive as they are, remain the best that American scholarship has produced.

Pound was also deeply involved in political, economic and social issues, while from 1913 onwards he supported droves of other struggling young poets too numerous to list individually here. In no case did Pound champion an as yet unknown American or European poet who did not later prove to be of exceptional merit. T. S. Eliot (1888-1964) never tired of asserting that - penniless and ill as he was and bound in a disastrous first marriage to a pathological woman ²⁸ - he would never have become known and made an artistic career without Ezra Pound. Even Eliot's first successful literary achievement, "The Wasteland", would have been a dismal failure had Pound not edited it and cut it in half.

Shortly before the outbreak of the First World War, Pound married an English woman, born Dorothy Shakespear ²⁹. Dorothy stood by Ezra Pound for

the rest of his life, with a selfless sincerity and joy. She never missed an opportunity to visit him during his long imprisonment in the United States, and the worst weeks of her life were those periods when she did not know where his henchmen had taken him or what new evils they had done to him.

Pound realized from day one - as did his wife and her English parents - that official England had made a terrible blunder in attacking the German cousins. Never in their entire history had there been war between the two countries. The Germany of 1914 was the best friend England had and could hope to have in the whole world, not to speak of the fact that Germany was also England's chief customer in world trade. Four years later, Pound stood near the unguarded carriage of King George V as it passed him on Armistice Day, November 11, 1918. A drawn peace would have been far preferable to the Allies' undeserved victory over Germany. The victory was solely due to Wilson's repeated betrayal of the German Kaiser, an honorable and brilliant ruler and lifelong peace-loving sovereign. Pound felt more miserable than at any time in his life before 1945. To make matters worse, the weather was cold and wet, and 1918 was the great influenza year: Pound caught a nasty cold³⁰^

At this time Pound was working with the brilliant English economic reformer and founder of the Social Credit movement, Major C. H. Douglas, who argued that capitalist industry was causing prices to rise faster than purchasing power and that only a system of social credit - a kind of advance on future productivity - could solve this problem without both ruinous inflation and the mad collectivism of Karl Marx. Pound had been courting Douglas ever since he discovered his ideas very poorly presented in his book "The Organizer"³¹ . Under Pound's historically broad intellectual leadership and excellent stylistic guidance, Douglas emerged in 1918 as an intellectual talent and a stylist of the first rank³², and since then the Douglasian Social Credit movement has never ceased to demand overdue socio-economic and political reforms in English-speaking countries. Pound continued to both promote and directly support Douglas until 1920, and after Pound left England, they worked together intensively by letter in later years.

When critics accused Pound of trying to become a virtuoso in the Baroque sense (because in the Baroque era the idea was widespread that a superior man had to become superior in everything and everyone), Pound replied that usury had ruined art in Renaissance Italy and that it was therefore the duty of every responsible artist to strive for a better art in a better socio-economic and political system³³^.

Pound also shared Nietzsche's conviction that modern plutocratic societies vomit their bile and then call it a newspaper. Pound claimed that journalism was the enemy of art because the aim of typical modern journalism was to give dull readers not what would advance them, but only what would satisfy their

prejudices, bad taste and vulgar appetites³⁵\ Pound thought that there was too much emphasis in English life on pragmatic utilitarianism and liberal laissez-faire, and not enough on the responsibility of a constructive society to ennoble the expectations of its citizens. Pound's father-in-law, a prominent and highly successful English lawyer, cursed the British dictator of the time, Lloyd George and his willingness to accept laws that were poorly drafted, misleading, limited and mendacious^{35^}

Pound's political commitment

It did not escape Pound's alert attention that only world Jewry emerged victorious from the First World War. He had already begun to realize in 1917 that the false theory of credit lay at the root of the economic, political and social malaise that plagued the West. Once filled with this realization, Pound never abandoned it and developed it publicly in his own books, lectures, essays and radio broadcasts, although this required enormous personal courage on the part of a celebrity like Pound, since in those twenties the United States and all European countries - including Mussolini's fascist Italy during its first decade - were chained hand and foot to the plutocratic-Jewish triumphalist chariot. Pound had no ethnic prejudices and never shared the snobbish prejudice against the Jews, as evidenced by the published work of T. S. Eliot. Pound's judgments were entirely the product of his longing for political, economic and social reform. In his typically straightforward and manly manner, Pound dropped slivers of thought here and there without the slightest concern for the personal consequences for himself. Although the Jews never liked T. S. Eliot, and he never liked them, the pro-Jewish British establishment - which was equally unenthusiastic about the Jews but relied on them solely for reasons of expediency - was nevertheless prepared to accept the born American and naturalized Englishman T. S. Eliot as its supreme literary idol and hero for thirty years (1935-1964), recognizing Eliot's aesthetic critique of Judaism as harmless - whereas Pound's serious racial critique was another matter entirely.

As soon as the First World War was over, Pound and his wife went on an extended trip to Paris and the south of France^{36^} Later, in 1927, Pound lamented in the *American Nation Magazine* that, in addition to all the other evils, the First World War had produced a terrible bureaucratic economy and a nagging awkwardness of passport control in most countries of the world. Before the war-but not since-there had been a genuine internationalism as opposed to the false, collectivist one of Wilson's League of Nations. Pound used to speak of the mind-substitute of the post-war Western officialdom. Pound also developed a concept during the 1920s, which he recalled in 1938 when he

expressed his approval and enthusiasm for the diplomatic success of the Munich Conference: "World peace will never be maintained except by a conspiracy of intelligent men."37

Munich was a good example of this; the men present were intelligent and peace was their goal. The war-mongering international conspiracies of Woody Wilson and Frank Roosevelt were the exact opposite. The conspiratorial makers, the American leaders, were not intelligent men, and what they aimed at was not responsible peace but senseless war of extermination.

Pound bravely condemned the League of Nations in public on January 8, 1920, before it began its always inconclusive and hypocritical formal sessions. For world peace, the League of Nations was not a help but a threat, "for any local conflict would tend to become a world conflict."38 After the United States had rejected Wilson, Wilson's Treaty of Versailles and Wilson's Geneva League of Nations, it was clear to Pound that the mainstay and controlling force of the new League of Nations system was exactly what Wilson had always had in mind: British imperialism. In a broader sense, Wilson was intent on subordinating the United States to British imperialism forever. Pound expressed "his growing antipathy to British civilization"39 in an essay, "The Curse,"40 in poetry form in a new collection of poems41 The pleasure Londoners had once found in Pound began to dim after eleven years when they saw that he-unlike most Americans who had long lived in London-had not become their creature, and so Pound was suddenly dropped for no understandable reason as the chief stage critic of the regarded Athenaeum. The English were still not used to tolerating constructive criticism from intellectually independent foreigners, and they continued to regard England as the leading world power. In 1920 it would have been unthinkable for an obscure man called Khrushchev to have told the English public on their own soil-as was actually to happen in 1954 after Stalin's death in Birmingham-that he would wipe out all their cities within forty-eight hours, and to have received only angry smiles in reply. Only fifteen years after the spiteful speech condemning and ostracizing Germany which Prime Minister Chamberlain was forced to make under Lord Halifax's compulsion in 1939, Khrushchev issued a public challenge to England which, through weakness, remained forever unanswered.

Before the end of 1920, Ezra and Dorothy Pound decided to move from London to Paris, a more welcoming and hospitable city, despite Pound's unflagging franchise brutale42 (brutal openness). The diplomatic tact of T. S. Eliot, which allowed him to live in relative peace in London despite his rejection of English politics, was alien to Pound. The latter told some delighted Frenchmen that "the disintegration of the British Empire was too depressing a spectacle to witness at close quarters"43^ Pound befriended Jean Cocteau, a brilliant and urbane French artist, who had said that he was very epicurean -

serenely serene - about the first military clashes between French and Germans on the front in Alsace in August 1914. In fact, this was a European war of annihilation that had its fantastic and tragic aspects, and Cocteau was never sure which side - if any - he should favor in this conflict. Pound was the first to bring Cocteau to the attention of the US by reviewing Cocteau's "Poesies 1917-1920" in the American literary magazine *Dial* in January 1921 - the magazine of which Pound was the permanent editor for new book publications ⁴

Ezra Pound and Mussolini

Pound was on the lookout for European statesmen whom he believed could effectively lead Europe in the quest for peace and stability, but it was not until the 1930s that he came to the realization that Mussolini and Hitler were the two leaders best suited to this role. Again, as in the case of the international financial machinations of world Jewry, once Pound had arrived at an insight by means of inductive scientific methodology and calm reasoning, he remained unconditionally faithful to it, regardless of personal consequences. It was not properly understood in the USA at the end of the Second World War that Pound had an even deeper admiration for Hitler than for Mussolini. The American media, which vilified Pound for years after FDR's 1937 Chicago speech, had created the fatuous impression that Pound's "difficulties stemmed from an emotional and irrational personal attachment to Mussolini. Pound may have liked the Duce, but he did not follow him. He met him in person only once, in 1933, when Mussolini, who had invited Pound to the Palazzo Venezia, praised Pound's literary achievements in the first decades of the "Cantos". Journalists who were allowed to interview Pound after he had been in American custody, but not yet in the military prison and the federal insane asylum in Washington, D. C., these journalists, in other words, were allowed to interview Pound. C., these journalists thought to embarrass Pound by asking his opinion of Mussolini's friend Hitler, a question which these ignorant and corrupt American newspapermen surely expected Pound, still threatened with summary execution, to tremble in horror at. Instead, Pound answered with firmness: "Hitler was a Joan of Arc, a saint. He was a martyr. "45 Pound then calmly began to justify his well-considered judgment with sharply reasoned and scholarly arguments. Equally typical of Pound's attitude after the Second World War was a letter he wrote in December 1945 to E. E. Cummings, a prominent American poet whose work he had promoted at the beginning: "So that was the work of 20 years, preventing the outbreak of the damned war. God bless the survivors. "46

Before moving from France to Italy in 1924, Pound also promoted the

literary career of Ernest Hemingway, whom Pound immediately admired as "an American roughneck" ⁴⁷. Although Hemingway moved far to the left ideologically after the outbreak of the Great Depression⁴⁸ and later became the most popular American novelist of the Roosevelt era, he never denied his unconditional admiration and enthusiasm for Pound and did everything in his power to get Pound out of prison during the forties and fifties. Hemingway's influence, his relationships and his unwavering and never wavering support were of greater importance than anything else for Pound's release from life imprisonment in 1958.

When the prominent pro-Stalinist American literary critic Edmund Wilson⁴⁹ made a vulgar public attack on Pound, he immediately received a sharp retort from T. S. Eliot, who was at the time the most influential, celebrated and respected English-language poet in the world. Eliot assured Wilson that he resented any and all unfair remarks about Pound as an affront to Western civilization, and insisted to Wilson that - despite Eliot's own renown - Pound was "the most important living poet in the English language" ⁵⁰.

Pound quickly realized after 1920 that Paris after the First World War was no longer the vigorous, healthy and vital Paris of 1914. The war had done all the work, with France having suffered the heaviest losses of all the belligerents in percentage terms. Pound noted that Paris had begun to remind him of "the undeniable debilitation of Proust" ⁵¹, the rich, prolific and decadent French-Jewish author whose work was eagerly promoted by the worldwide Jewish media⁵².

Pound left France in 1924 and settled in Rapallo/Italy, his residence for twenty-one years until his arrest by American agents after the Italian-German withdrawal from Liguria in 1945. There was nothing planned or predetermined about his choice of Italy, although his European domicile in Rapallo was centrally located and his decision was influenced partly by his admiration for Mussolini's powerful new government and partly by Pound's own intensive research into two brilliant Italian Renaissance heroes, Niccolò d'Este (1304-1341) and Sigismondo Malatesta (1417-1468). After settling in Italy, Pound limited his travels to European countries until he decided to visit the USA again in 1939/53.

Return to the USA to fight against Roosevelt rule

Between his move to Italy in 1924 and his decision to return to the USA fifteen years later, Pound continued to develop his socio-economic and political worldview⁵⁴. He gave his final public verdict on Stalin and Jewish Bolshevism

in 1938: "Communism with its dictatorship of the proletariat is barbaric and Hebrew alone."⁵⁵ In short, Pound's political position was one of solid support for Hitler and Mussolini in Europe without advocating a radical change in the mechanics of the old U.S. political system-but a change in practice: here Pound, following in LaFollette's footsteps, advocated cleanliness in politics and a rejection of the age-old dictatorial domination of the United States by its traditional Pluto oligarchy. Although he valued private life in Europe more than in the U.S., he was willing to return to America for good in 1939, provided he could-if he made this personal sacrifice-work as an economic and political advisor, and provided also that FDR could be prevented from realizing his plan to set the world on fire in personal league with Stalin. In his extensive correspondence with the USA before 1939, Pound explained his position as an advocacy of the sovereignty of national cultures in contrast to the "disruptions of the Marxist internationalists, Jews and so on"⁵⁶.

Pound argued compellingly that the time had come in the USA to overthrow the collective dictatorship of usurocracy (this was Pound's term for the American plutocratic oligarchy⁵⁷). Before traveling to the United States, Pound wrote a letter to Senator William Borah, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on January 13, 1939. Pound congratulated Borah on his many Senate victories over Roosevelt's war policy since FDR's Chicago speech of October 5, 1937. Pound proposed a new Western community of reason and common sense based on the Four-Power Agreement of Munich between England, France, Italy and Germany and the special slogan: "No more war west of the Vistula."⁵⁸

Pound also wrote on the same day to House member Tinkham of Massachusetts, who had been a powerful leader in the House of Representatives for two decades. Pound claimed that all British politicians were corrupt and venal, except perhaps Chamberlain. Pound was too optimistic about Chamberlain, as his total reversal under Lord Halifax's pressure was to show⁵⁹.

Pound departed Genoa on the "Rex" on April 13, 1939 and arrived in New York City on April 21, a week before Hitler's successful Reichstag speech in which he rejected FDR's crude and arrogant warmongering propaganda in his public message to Hitler and Mussolini on April 15, 1939⁶⁰. In an interview for the New York press on the day of his arrival, Pound told American reporters, "Only villainy can unleash a new war west of the Vistula."⁶¹

Pound praised the socially conscience-driven American poetry of E. E. Cummings, who had written of his mother's attitude at the time of his own participation in World War I: "My mother hopes I will die - bravely, of course." This referred to the fact that many American mothers were keen on the prestigious gold stars awarded when a son died in battle.

After a brief stay with a friend, John Slocum, in New York City, Pound spent

several weeks of intense activity in Washington, DC. C., in conferences with Senators, Congressmen, and with a member of FDR's cabinet, Henry Wallace, the Secretary of Agriculture. Wallace became the vice-presidential candidate in FDR's third presidential bid in 1940. Probably the most stimulating and personally rewarding for Pound was a meeting with Sen. Burton K. Wheeler of Montana, one of the most effective critics of FDR's foreign policy abuses. Pound's greatest disappointment, however-and one of crucial importance-was Senator Borah, who hailed from Pound's own birth region in Idaho and whose work in the U.S. Senate Pound had admired for two decades, including Borah's role in the Senate's rejection of the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations. Borah said he was willing to stay in the United States and serve as an official counselor to the anti-Roosevelt Republican and Democratic parties in the Senate. This was exactly what Rarnilton A. Long later did as a House and Senate aide against the domestic and foreign policy veeps of E senhowei, Kennedy and Johnson. Pound, however, soon realized that Boiah, who was gradually, perhaps unconsciously, intimidated by the daily threats he received from world Jewry over his opposition, was afraid to have an outspoken critic of world Jewry like Pound on his staff.

This was indeed the key point in the difficulties Pound encountered in his beloved America in 1939. Every Piomi- nent was frightened by the cruel and unscrupulous Jewish misdeeds in public life of the likes of Baiuch, Rosenman, Lehman, LaGuardia, Fiankfuitei, Brandeis, Moigenthaus, Sulzberger and Moidecai Ezekiel. These insiders were left to speak and act in shadowy half-truths when fighting FDR's crazy schemes, instead of telling the whole truth, as the late Huey P. Long or Bob LaFollette would have done or encouraged. The absence of a truly great leader like Fighting Bob put FDR's opponents at a serious disadvantage. They knew that FDR was a monster, and that he was wrong, but he had the immense Jewish power behind him, while his opponents, though much smarter than he, were only mediocre timid men. Even Senator Wheeler and Colonel Charles Lindbergh, Jr, the bravest and most outspoken national leaders against FDR after 1937, wasted much of their time fearing FDR and his Jews and wondering what would happen next to intimidate and harm them. They all recognized in Pound a great man with considerable aptitude for leadership, but because the rest of FDR's opponents were accustomed to half-truths - like the half loaves of bread LaFollette had warned about - they feared Pound's honesty and feared his mission.

Pound had the impression that in 1939 he had encountered an enfeebled, hollowed-out America rather than the vigorous and carefree young United States that had existed in the correspondence between Thomas Jefferson and John Adams in those last years before both died in 1826 and that had persisted in his own memory from his youth. As with all American patriots, at least fifty

percent of what Pound had thought of his beloved America over the years had been merely wishful thinking. Pound came to the sad but absolutely correct conclusion in May 1939 that the USA had fallen into "degeneracy" ⁶³.

The USA had never possessed even half of the virtues that Pound had once attributed to the country. The most degrading experience among many others Pound had on this trip occurred at Hamilton College, his alma mater, where Pound was invited to receive an honorary doctorate in June 1939. Pound went there in good faith and good humor after an encouraging meeting with Polish Ambassador Count Potocki, who shared Pound's knowledge of Jewish domination of the U.S. and who warned Polish Foreign Minister Beck in Warsaw in 1939 that England and the U.S. were trying to use Poles alone "like Negroes" against Germany to get the new war they both wanted by artificial means. Potocki was referring to the American and British disregard for Polish life and well-being in their determination to find any instrument in the world with which they could prevent the attack of a britically led international coalition on Germany of the kind that Halifax, Churchill, Roosevelt, Morgenthau and Stalin so ardently longed for ⁶⁴

Pound arrived in Clinton, New York, the site of Hamilton College not far from Utica, on June 9 to receive his honorary degree. Meanwhile, College President Cowley had received so many terrible Jewish threats for daring to offer Pound an honorary degree in the first place that he decided, in a state of desperation bordering on panic, to award a second honorary degree in the form of a balanced program to H. V. Kaltenborn, FDR's favorite American journalist. (Here my judgment is based on a personal acquaintance with the late H. V. Kaltenborn and an exhaustive knowledge of his media propaganda). Kaltenborn was a dogmatic man of dismissive arrogance, and as far as his incessant slander of the "Axis" in Europe was concerned, he outdid all other American commentators as a primitive and crude liar-in-chief. Cowley's craven fear of FDR and world Jewry against his better judgment and his subsequent blatant affront to Pound—just for the sake of his own safety—was a microcosm of the United States in 1939, on the eve of England's Lord Halifax unleashing World War II with the blessing of FDR, Stalin and world Jewry.

It was Kaltenborn, not Pound, who appointed Cowley to speak at the luncheon immediately following the promotion ceremony. Kaltenborn's speech was a pointed attack on Pound and contained Kaltenborn's usual vulgar, irresponsible and deliberately false slander of the "Axis. Pound had intended not to be provoked, but for him the height of the challenge was reached when Kaltenborn made a disparaging remark about the "Steel Pact", the defense alliance that had been concluded by Germany and Italy in Milan the month before. When Kaltenborn called the steel pact a "dubious alliance" with barely disguised contempt, Pound jumped up, interrupted Kaltenborn and delivered an

impassioned defense of Hitler and Mussolini's 1939 foreign policy.

Finally, President Cowley intervened and demanded that Pound remain silent. Pound complied, but retaliated in an interview with the region's leading local newspaper, the Utica Daily Press, on June 10, 1939. June 10, 1939, in which he refrained from demeaning himself by any complaint about the venal Cowley, and also considered it beneath his dignity to respond to Kaltenborn's blather, but nobly and skillfully made all the accusations against FDR's villainy in world politics since the latter had dropped the mask in his Chicago Bridge speech with its presumptuous personal declaration of war on Germany, Italy and Japan⁶⁵.

A farewell to hopelessness

Stock was nevertheless right in his remark that Pound finally left Rarnilton College as a "sad and disappointed man "⁶⁶ . A few days later, as quickly as a passage could be booked, he set sail from New York aboard the Conte di Savoia for Genoa, having come to the final conclusion that the USA was in a hopeless state under FDR's dictatorial rule⁶⁷. .

Pound's disappointment in 1939 in the USA did not turn into lasting anger, and certainly not into hatred, for Pound was too much the creative poetic genius with a keen sense of the great current of world history with its ebbs and flows for these base emotions. Pound went back to Genoa at peace with himself and unimpaired in his energy and sense of purpose. He had done his best to volunteer a selfless service to his country, the United States, in an hour of great need, but conditions in America had quickly deteriorated to the point where no one who had anything to say dared to make use of Pound's righteousness, genius and sagacity. History would now take its course toward senseless catastrophe and the destruction of all efforts to regenerate the West - but Pound was determined to continue on the same straight path that had always characterized his own life, a path he followed cheerfully and without complaint until the end of his life in Europe, thirty-three years later. For his moral integrity at least, if for no other reason, Pound's place of honor in history remains secure as that of an imperishable witness for international justice.

Concluding remark

The powerful and elusive variable in the analysis of the crisis of the West - from which all contemporary philosophy of history must proceed - has now become clearly visible. With the decline of British imperialism and the

persistence of Bolshevism and Zionism - thanks to the support both have received from the US - the role of the US itself has become recognizable in its true light: as the main catalyst for the decline of the West as a whole. Fortunately, the legacy of Wilson and Roosevelt is now rapidly collapsing in a chaos of unprecedented mismanagement. In the West, the road back to freedom is open again.